1568/2131.
(+)

A

CRITICAL REVIEW,

&c. &c. &c.

MY LORD,

YOUR celebrated publication *On the preſent State of the Church of Ireland*, having gone through ſix editions in leſs than one month, raiſed my expectations to a very high degree. I thought it would ſurpaſs in ſubſtance, as well as in form, the many vile productions which have of late appeared for the pious purpoſe of alarming and deceiving, in the ſame proportion as your Lordſhip's exalted ſtation overlooks the narrow boundaries of groveling mortals. Your name, prefixed to this performance, I firſt conſidered as a mark of ſincerity which challenged applauſe; and though I have ſince perceived its real tendency, I ſhall not avail myſelf of the advantage which it affords me by any perſonal attacks on your Lordſhip: your reaſoning, my Lord, and not your perſon, ſhall be the object of my cenſures. If my criticiſm can claim no other merit, it ſhall, at leaſt,

be fair: the little arts of ſophiſtry I diſdain, the cauſe of truth requires no ſuch aſſiſtance. In examining, and in combating your arguments, I ſhall ſtate ſimple facts; compare only thoſe things which naturally bear a compariſon, and graſp at no more in my concluſions, than what is entirely contained in, and immediately flow from, my premiſes. Reaſon, I truſt, ſhall be my guide. I ſhall endeavour to preſerve that coolneſs which it demands, and that reſpect for the public which it inſpires. At the ſame time I beg leave to appriſe your Lordſhip, that I mean to argue with that freedom which becomes a man, and with that indifference to rank or ſtation which philoſophy preſcribes; for we no ſooner deſcend to the ground of argument, than philoſophy places us all on a level.

My Lord, I am much diſappointed in my expectations: Your laboured pamphlet, with an advertiſement to the reader, an introduction, a poſtſcript, and three appendixes, is in ſubſtance the ſame with thoſe wretched compoſitions which the candid mind muſt ever reprobate, and the man of reaſon deſpiſe. It wears, it is true, a different dreſs, common decency required it; but the ſame miſrepreſentations, the ſame gratuitous aſſumption of principles, the ſame looſe concluſions, the ſame unfair compariſons, the ſame evaſions, ſlights and feints pervade the whole. Things are managed, I own, with an art and plauſibility capable of impoſing on the bigotted, the ſuperficial, and the unread, and of this merit I leave your Lordſhip in full poſſeſſion.

The work is divided into eight ſections. I ſhall follow your Lordſhip ſtep by ſtep, and be as brief as the ſubject matter will permit.

SECTION

BRITISH MUSEUM 30 62 APR

SECTION I.

THE firſt ſection opens with a curious train of very fanciful, and very groundleſs ſpeculations, on the natural conformity of different religions, with different forms of government. We are told that Popery is the religion of deſpotic ſtates, Calviniſm of republics, and that free mixed governments, ſuch as ours, cannot ſubſiſt without the reformation of Luther, or Epiſcopacy, as it is called. Theſe airy fictions are very flattering to the pious Proteſtant of the eſtabliſhed church; for our civil conſtitution is ſaid to be confeſſedly the beſt that ever exiſted, and of courſe the religion which only ſuits it, muſt have an undiſputed claim to perfection and excellence. To ſupport this theory, the religious tenets of Catholics and of Preſbyterians are pointed out, and to confirm the truth of it, the evidence of hiſtorical facts is confidently appealed to. But, my Lord, hiſtory is, in this inſtance, ſo garbled and ſo falſified, that we can already perceive with what eaſe you can build a ſyſtem. Fancy has only to conceive the outlines as you wiſh: out of the immenſe ſtock of human affairs, let thoſe materials only be ſelected which ſerve your purpoſe; and if any occur which do not ſuit, let them be faſhioned and adapted as you command. Such are the rules from which your ſyſtem ſprung, a ſyſtem ſo oppoſite to nature, and to genuine hiſtorical facts, that I need only adduce them, and it moulders away without the aid of any reaſoning *a priori*.

It is a fact, my Lord, that the Catholic religion compriſes within her pale more Republics than any other religion upon earth!—After the ſubver-

ſion of the Roman Empire, where did Republics firſt ariſe and liberty rear her head? In Catholic Italy. Where are Republics now moſt numerous and moſt jealous of their freedom? In Catholic Italy. The Catholic Cantons of Switzerland are democratic, and exhibit civil liberty in her higheſt perfection; the Proteſtant Cantons are ariſtocratic. It is only in theſe Cantons, and in the Republic of Holland, that Preſbyterianiſm, as a ſtate religion, rejects the idea of a King. In Scotland it does not, nor did it in Navarre, when Henry the Fourth of France ruled in that kingdom. Lutheraniſm is the ſtate religion in Pruſſia, and Pruſſia is as deſpotic a government as any in Europe. The Lutheran Electors are abſolute, as well as the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark; "but "they were not ſo immediately after they adopt-"ed the Proteſtant religion;" true, my Lord, nor were they ſo when they were Catholic.—Spain, with her Cortes, and France, with her States General, were Catholic, and enjoyed a greater ſhare of civil liberty than any other kingdoms then in being.—Even in Britain, our boaſted conſtitution was firſt framed by Catholics. Magna Charta was obtained by Catholic Barons.—Here, my Lord, I muſt expreſs my aſtoniſhment, and reclaim that candour which you profeſs, and which juſtice demands.—You adduce the obtaining of Magna Charta as a proof that our civil and religious conſtitutions are eſſentially interwoven; and you ſay, that the firſt article in that famous Charter was, that the church of England ſhould preſerve her rights and immunities. You thus evidently intimate, that the church of England was then Proteſtant: And could you forget, my Lord, or could you think that your fondeſt admirers would forget, that the Barons who obtained that Charter were headed by a Pope's Legate? My

Lord,

Lord, I am aſtoniſhed, and I leave the public to judge of the degree of candour which they are to expect.—From the preceding facts, which no man can controvert with effect, it may be concluded: But before I draw my concluſion, I muſt take notice of the religious tenets which you aſcribe to different denominations of Chriſtians, and which you ſay tend to produce different forms of government. My Lord, I muſt here remark, that your language is, in many places, very vague and indeterminate, ſo that were I to enter into a diſcuſſion of it with minute accuracy, I ſhould be under the neceſſity of writing volumes on your pamphlet; I muſt, therefore, often aim at your meaning in a general manner. If I miſtake it in the ſmalleſt inſtance, let me be ſet right, for I moſt ſolemnly proteſt, that no wilful miſrepreſentation ſhall drop from my pen.

When you ſay, that Papal tyranny is a fit engine for deſpotic power, if I underſtand you right, your meaning is, that Catholics allow the Pope all power and authority, whence his right to an univerſal domination in all caſes whatſoever. This doctrine, though conſtantly diſclaimed by every Catholic univerſity, ſchool, or approved writer in the world, is ſtill moſt charitably imputed to them. My Lord, the religious tenets of Roman Catholics, with regard to the Pope's authority, and the origin of that confuſion in which pious calumniators have involved it, I ſhall briefly ſtate.

Catholics conſider the authority of their church as merely ſpiritual, matters of faith being the only object of that authority. They think that Chriſt eſtabliſhed two orders in his church, the order of Biſhops and the order of Prieſts. The Pope they hold to be chief Biſhop, head of the church, center of unity. Each order they believe to be inveſted

ſion of the Roman Empire, where did Republics firſt ariſe and liberty rear her head? In Catholic Italy. Where are Republics now moſt numerous and moſt jealous of their freedom? In Catholic Italy. The Catholic Cantons of Switzerland are democratic, and exhibit civil liberty in her higheſt perfection; the Proteſtant Cantons are ariſtocratic. It is only in theſe Cantons, and in the Republic of Holland, that Preſbyterianiſm, as a ſtate religion, rejects the idea of a King. In Scotland it does not, nor did it in Navarre, when Henry the Fourth of France ruled in that kingdom. Lutheraniſm is the ſtate religion in Pruſſia, and Pruſſia is as deſpotic a government as any in Europe. The Lutheran Electors are abſolute, as well as the kingdoms of Sweden and Denmark; "but "they were not ſo immediately after they adopt-"ed the Proteſtant religion;" true, my Lord, nor were they ſo when they were Catholic.—Spain, with her Cortes, and France, with her States General, were Catholic, and enjoyed a greater ſhare of civil liberty than any other kingdoms then in being.—Even in Britain, our boaſted conſtitution was firſt framed by Catholics. Magna Charta was obtained by Catholic Barons.—Here, my Lord, I muſt expreſs my aſtoniſhment, and reclaim that candour which you profeſs, and which juſtice demands.—You adduce the obtaining of Magna Charta as a proof that our civil and religious conſtitutions are eſſentially interwoven; and you ſay, that the firſt article in that famous Charter was, that the church of England ſhould preſerve her rights and immunities. You thus evidently intimate, that the church of England was then Proteſtant: And could you forget, my Lord, or could you think that your fondeſt admirers would forget, that the Barons who obtained that Charter were headed by a Pope's Legate? My

Lord,

Lord, I am aſtoniſhed, and I leave the public to judge of the degree of candour which they are to expect.—From the preceding facts, which no man can controvert with effect, it may be concluded: But before I draw my concluſion, I muſt take notice of the religious tenets which you aſcribe to different denominations of Chriſtians, and which you ſay tend to produce different forms of government. My Lord, I muſt here remark, that your language is, in many places, very vague and indeterminate, ſo that were I to enter into a diſcuſſion of it with minute accuracy, I ſhould be under the neceſſity of writing volumes on your pamphlet; I muſt, therefore, often aim at your meaning in a general manner. If I miſtake it in the ſmalleſt inſtance, let me be ſet right, for I moſt ſolemnly proteſt, that no wilful miſrepreſentation ſhall drop from my pen.

When you ſay, that Papal tyranny is a fit engine for deſpotic power, if I underſtand you right, your meaning is, that Catholics allow the Pope all power and authority, whence his right to an univerſal domination in all caſes whatſoever. This doctrine, though conſtantly diſclaimed by every Catholic univerſity, ſchool, or approved writer in the world, is ſtill moſt charitably imputed to them. My Lord, the religious tenets of Roman Catholics, with regard to the Pope's authority, and the origin of that confuſion in which pious calumniators have involved it, I ſhall briefly ſtate.

Catholics conſider the authority of their church as merely ſpiritual, matters of faith being the only object of that authority. They think that Chriſt eſtabliſhed two orders in his church, the order of Biſhops and the order of Prieſts. The Pope they hold to be chief Biſhop, head of the church, center of unity. Each order they believe to be inveſted

veſted with particular independent rights, and all confined within the boundaries eſtabliſhed from the beginning, ſo that no power on earth can frame a new article of faith. They think the Goſpel affords evident proofs of a pre-eminence, or ſupremacy, granted to St. Peter over the reſt of the Apoſtles; and church hiſtory informs them, that the Biſhops of Rome, his ſucceſſors, exerciſed this ſupremacy over all other Biſhops from the earlieſt antiquity. Thoſe ſeveral powers and rights of Chief Biſhop, Biſhops, and Prieſts, ſubſiſted for many centuries, while no Biſhop or Prieſt on earth poſſeſſed any temporal power or riches; they intermeddled not in civil or political matters; wherefore, as the ſacred orders held their powers independent of, and ſeparate from, all human affairs, ſo in after times, when the bounty of Princes, and piety of individuals, called them to affluence and to worldly conſequence, their ſpiritual powers are not thought to be by theſe means either increaſed or diminiſhed: Nay, while a thick darkneſs ſettled over the weſtern world; while the Clergy poſſeſſed enormous wealth and enormous power; while abuſes and ſcandals multiplied, it never was an article of faith in the Catholic Church, that our obedience was due to Prieſt, Biſhop, or Pope, in any caſes different from matters of faith; and yet the abuſes of which Churchmen have been guilty, by interfering in political matters, by graſping at temporal power, and by wielding ſpiritual arms for its ſupport, are, to this day, charged on Catholics as tenets of their religion, by the bigoted, the deſigning, and the ignorant. Though no man reprobates theſe abuſes more than I do, yet the love of truth obliges me to ſay, that they have been exaggerated, and placed in a falſe and malignant light, by an undiſtinguiſhing bigotry. The ſlighteſt acquaint-

ance

ance with the history of mankind, with the different characters and manners of different ages, will exhibit things in their true light.

When the wild torrent of barbarians had overwhelmed the Roman Empire, and left no trace of literature, arts, or sciences, a general darkness overspread the West, which continued for many ages. These times are very absurdly called by some the ages of popish or monkish ignorance, whereas no fact is more true in history, than that whatever light remained was to be found with the Pope, the monks, and the secular clergy. Various causes contributed to the continuation of this darkness, and during such a gloomy period, a barbarous superstition, a perversion of natural justice, succeeded to a want of written laws or of any jurisprudence. Society felt the dire influence in the civil as well as political department, and the open wounds which Christian morality received, induced the clergy to interfere in temporal matters, sometimes with the best intentions, and often from a sense of their duty. The confusion also into which the laity were often thrown, and their insufficiency to remedy the most serious evils, laid them under a necessity of appealing to the clergy, who were the most, I might have said the only, competent judges in these barbarous ages. The clergy did not refuse to accept of an honourable office, and thus to increase their power and influence; nor do I know a protestant prelate who would refuse such an offer this day. The sovereign pontiffs were in like manner appealed to by emperors and kings, and by subjects against their sovereigns: for the tenure of thrones must be then precarious, and the political machine very unstable, when no well regulated government was to be found.—The popes availed themselves of these opportunities—Their temporal power soon

grew

grew into a regular form. This power they ſometimes carried to the moſt indecent exceſſes: but it muſt be alſo owned that they often exerciſed it for the benefit of mankind. The great Leibnitz a proteſtant, but not a bigot, a man who looked over nature with a philoſophic eye, declares that this power has often ſaved mankind from great evils. It is ſurely ridiculous in the extreme to ſpeak of this power as if it had been the only tyrannical power upon earth, whereas few, very few, earthly powers, appear in any age, that are not juſtly chargeable with tyranny and oppreſſion.

Whatever may be ſaid for or againſt the temporal power of Popes, it is certain that the cauſes which gave riſe and ſupport to it no ſooner began to vaniſh than it fled with them. The firſt dawn of light ſcarce appeared when it was ſeen to totter; and it ceaſed to be formidable before Luther aroſe. The light of that age is not his. The golden days of Leo owe nothing to the reformation of Luther.—At preſent this power exiſts no where except in the eccleſiaſtical ſtate, where the Pope is acknowledged as a temporal ſovereign. In Spain or Portugal it is no more felt or dreaded than in Pruſſia or England; nay, it is worthy of remark, that in the catholic republic of Venice, adjoining the eccleſiaſtical ſtate, the clergy are more completely debarred from civil and political concerns than in any proteſtant ſtate in Europe. Need I ſay more, my Lord, to ſhew that your principle of papal tyranny is void of foundation?

The levelling principle which you aſcribe to preſbyterians is not better founded; it is a vague word without meaning, which ſatisfies ſome people, becauſe it flatters their prejudices. Preſbyterians allow but one order of churchmen, that of

elders,

elders, which they eſtabliſh by election of the people. The offices and duties of churchmen they conſider as ſpiritual, and allow them no temporal authority.—If we ſuppoſe that Preſbyterians lay a peculiar ſtreſs on the natural rights of mankind; and on that idea of natural liberty, which leads to a democratic government, we muſt not imagine that they therefore overlook what ſociety demands. They allow that different manners, different maxims, and different ſituations may require different forms of government among different people: that the peace and good order of ſociety are to be ſupported, and that no ends are to be purſued by baſe means. With theſe reſtrictions every rational Catholic and Church of England Man will agree to the maxim, that all people are by right entitled to the enjoyment of as great a ſhare of liberty as the ſecurity, peace, and happineſs of ſociety will admit, and that this ſhare of liberty ſhould be meaſured, not by the fears, whims, and fancies of bigots and tyrants, but by the rules of reaſon, which being invariable, would ever appear juſt to all parties.

My Lord, you, moreover, mean, that the odious principles of which I have been ſpeaking exert their influence, not only among Catholics and Preſbyterians, but that they extend farther, and neceſſarily tend to deſtroy the eſtabliſhments of others. If you mean the ſpiritual eſtabliſhments, and would thus perſuade the world that the two *diſſenting bodies* are inclined to that worſt ſpecies of tyranny, the forcing of conſciences, nothing can be more falſe or illiberal: they diſavow, they condemn ſuch intolerance. In barbarous ages, it is true, a perverſion of their religious tenets, and a corruption of their principles, ſometimes occaſioned by a baſe alloy of political ideas, hurried Chriſtians of every deſcription into theſe enormities;

mities; but these times have passed away, and the bigotry to which they gave rise is no more; all parties have shared in it, and in the discussion of it the Lutherans would not be the gainers.—Whatever degree of spirituality the word establishment conveys, the temporalities of the church are evidently its grand object: Temporalities, my Lord, which occupy the fore ground, nay the whole ground of your pamphlet. Temporalities, which seem to be, with your Lordship, *the one thing needful*. Temporalities, without which you seem not to conceive either church or religion, or morality, and in the limiting, endangering, or extending of which we imagine you think that virtue itself is limited, endangered, or extended. Without dwelling at present on the absurdity of these notions, which your Lordship assumes as so many principles, I shall speak of the general sense of the Christian world on the subject, more especially of the sense of Catholics, as they have had the greatest experience in these matters.

Catholics conceive, that the church can subsist without any fixed temporalities appropriated for the use of the clergy. Such was the case, say they, in primitive times, and primitive times were most certainly the brightest and purest ages of Christianity. It is, however, pretty generally acknowledged that a decent competency, proportioned to the rank of Churchmen, is at present useful, and perhaps necessary. But that temporalities should be excessive, unchangeable, unalienable, are ideas which Catholics have long since exploded as prejudicial to religion, and to the propagation of it. Some Catholic powers have set about correcting these abuses; for they consider them as such; and if the temporal power of the clergy, and their influence over sovereigns did

not

not prevent it, the ſenſe of the Catholic world would, I believe, tend to an oppoſite extreme! In this kingdom it may be pretty generally obſerved, that the humble farmer contributes more to the ſcanty ſupport of the poor pariſh prieſt than the man of immenſe landed property. Such is that formidable propenſity of Catholics to pull down every thing for the purpoſe of erecting temporal eſtabliſhments for their clergy.

But, my Lord, you profeſs to conſider the church only in a political light, as eſſentially interwoven with the conſtitution; ſo that this great fabric is moſt ſeriouſly threatened if the ſmalleſt change happen in the temporalities of the church. —My Lord, all this is very vague, ambiguous, and fallacious: I ſuſpect it contains ſome Pagan ideas which Chriſtianity rejects.—In Pagan times ſcarce a legiſlator appeared who did not make uſe of religion as a political engine to give weight and ſtability to his code of laws: but this uſe of falſe religion was very different from that to which Chriſtianity is by its name adapted. Falſe religion was a neceſſary ingredient in the civil conſtitutions of Pagan times. The feeble light of the natural law was not ſufficient to regulate or to reſtrain the paſſions of men: and when theſe paſſions are in a general tide let looſe upon ſociety, no government can ſubſiſt. It was then neceſſary that falſe religion, by powerfully operating on the fears and ſuperſtitions of men, ſhould ſupply a remedy which human wiſdom could not provide.—But under the Chriſtian diſpenſation, when the darkeſt receſſes are illumined by a light truly divine; when the means of rectifying every diſorder, and of reſtraining every exceſs, are clearly pointed out, all that a wiſe and good government ſhould require from the church is, that the clergy do exert themſelves with indefatigable

zeal

zeal in performing their functions. Thus would morality flouriſh. Thus would individuals ſee and love their duty. Thus would ſociety tend to perfection, and governments become ſtable and ſecure.—According to theſe ideas no ſtate religion is neceſſary. All the different forms of Chriſtianity might enjoy equal liberty under the ſame civil conſtitution, and all equally contribute to its ſupport—Neither is the notion of a ſtate religion contrary to reaſon, or to the general good, when by ſtate religion is meant a particular form of worſhip which government endows with particular privileges and temporalities, ſo as not to infringe on the rights or intereſts of any claſs of people. In this ſenſe a ſtate religion might have its advantages: but to ſay that it or the civil conſtitution, under which it derives, can be ſecured or benefited, by exceſſive temporalities beſtowed on the clergy, by an unequal mode of taxation, by oppreſſive and vexatious diſtinctions, is not warranted by reaſon, by humanity, or by ſound policy: much leſs can ſuch a means of propagating or of ſupporting religion be reconciled with that enlightened zeal which the Goſpel points out, and which Churchmen ſhould adopt. My Lord I could here expoſtulate on the want of that enlightened zeal in the clergy, and clearly ſhew that the virtues which this zeal inſpires are not practicable or agreeable amidſt the enjoyment of the good things of this life. Hence the frequent appeals to the civil power for the protection of religion, a means very ill ſuited to the end propoſed, a means that muſt ever defeat itſelf, for the civil power can only uphold the external form of religion, while the ſubſtance will decay for want of its natural ſupports.

It is time, my Lord, that we ſpeak of concluſions. Your concluſion from the ſtrange poſitions

to

to which we have been ſpeaking, is ſtrange indeed, and ſufficient to damn whole volumes of reaſoning; for if the concluſion revolts common ſenſe, the premiſes from which it has been drawn muſt be falſe and groundleſs. That more than nine tenths of the people of Ireland are not entitled to national confidence, is a concluſion replete with political miſchief, and to none more alarming than to government. It equally militates againſt the Emperor's Lutheran ſubjects, and would univerſally authoriſe as cruel tyranny as was ever exerciſed on the ſcore of religion.—My concluſions are very different, they ſay that all deſcriptions of Chriſtians may be well affected, and cordially attached to any form of governmcnt which provides for their temporal happineſs. That the peace and good order of ſociety are with them capital objects not to be hazarded, except in caſes of the laſt extremity. That ſpiritual and temporal concerns are by nature diſtinct, and muſt appear ſo to all Chriſtians who would ſincerely adhere to the religious tenets which they profeſs. That theſe tenets always coinciding with, and ſtrengthening the laws of nature, teach Chriſtians to riſque property, and even life for the public weal, in the cauſe of their country, or in defence of their ſovereign, whatever be his religious perſuaſion. That the converſion of thoſe who are thought to be in error, being a matter purely ſpiritual, ſhould only be attempted by ſpiritual means as the Goſpel directs, by perſuaſion, good example, &c.—Our concluſions, my Lord, are quite oppoſite, which of them future ſtateſmen will adopt for the regulation of their conduct I ſhall not pretend to ſay: ſure I am that mine are more agreeable to the principles of Chriſtianity,

My

My Lord, before I quit your firſt ſection, I muſt take notice of the attempts which you make to give ſome colour to the monſtrous principles with which you ſet out. The proofs of the religious tenets of Catholics, being ſuch as would ſuit your Lordſhip's purpoſe, are curious indeed. To me it ſeems reaſonable, that on this queſtion, recourſe ſhould be had to the deciſions of the Councils, the doctrine of the Univerſities, or at leaſt the common catechiſms of Catholics, not to the idle vagaries of individuals on matters in which they are allowed no concern. Your Lordſhip has choſe the latter way, no doubt, becauſe it ſeemed the way to truth. You recede from a luminous and beaten track, you turn from the celebrated works of Catholic writers, and you light on the Hibernia Dominicana, in which you find the letter * of a Pope's Nuncio.—An admirable diſcovery! But, my Lord, if Catholics deſpiſe this obſcure work as much as you do; if it was cenſured as ſoon as it appeared by an aſſembly of Catholic biſhops; is it a proper ſource for general concluſions? Juſtice and candour are here violated as well as logic. Far be it from me to ſet down to the charge of the Proteſtants of Ireland, or of any other country, the many points of deteſtable doctrine contained, not in concluſions but in principles, which I could cull out of ſome of their writers, yes, my Lord, out of the very fathers of the reformation. I would not urge ſuch an argument, your Lordſhip would not admit it, and yet I defy your Lordſhip to ſhew a diſparity.

* The miſrepreſentations on this letter, and on the conſecration oath of Catholic biſhops, are fully laid open in the excellent perfoi mances of the moſt Rev. Dr. Burler and of the Rev. Mr. O'Leary. As the Biſhop of Cloyne's reaſoning is the object of my criticiſm, to ſtrike at its foundation is ſufficient for my purpoſe.

disparity.—Great indeed seems to be your Lordship's condescension in admitting the Gallican liberties; but you do so with a view of bearing hard on the rest of the Catholic world. In as much as these liberties secure the supreme temporal power of the state, they are universal. No Catholic state on earth, except the ecclesiastical, allows the Pope any temporal authority; in this assertion I am not to be refuted.—What your Lordship says of the bull Unigenitus, betrays a strange want of information. The Gallican liberties, you say, did not gain ground by the proceedings in 1765 on the bull Unigenitus. My Lord, the bull Unigenitus was issued in the beginning of the present century, at the request of all the Bishops of France, except three or four, and at the desire of the then reigning King, Lewis XIV. It went to condemn certain errors on the very abstruse doctrine of grace; and how it could affect the Gallican liberties I know not. Your anachronism I could more readily forgive, though with the loss of more than a century, than many other things contained in your first section.

My Lord, I have examined, and, I think, disjointed the most material parts of your first section. It still contains many hints which might lead to long discussions; but I have already passed my limits, and shall proceed on, hoping to find a place, before I finish, for these well meant innuendoes. The final purport of your first section seems to be, to fill the Protestants of the established church with fears and alarms, and thus prepare them for the reception of whatever you please. This is one of those sophistical stratagems with which your Lordship seems well acquainted, and to which your pamphlet seems much indebted. Another stratagem of the same kind, universally diffused through the remaining sections, I shall beg

leave

leave to mention. It is to level your chief force againſt a phantom, or to point to an inſignificant collateral circumſtance, as the main fort of the oppoſite ſide; to direct your approaches and attacks on this ground with oſtentation and parade, avoiding, or ſlightly touching upon the great difficulties which confront you, and which as yet remain entire. By this ſtratagem the ſuperficial part of mankind eaſily loſe ſight of the queſtion, and readily ſubmit to a train of reaſoning, which may be in itſelf faultleſs, but which has no more relation to the point in queſtion, than Morocco has to Indoſtan. My Lord, this mode of attack may diſplay your abilities, but does not prove the goodneſs of your cauſe; it may amuſe the prejudiced and the ignorant, but it will never impoſe on men of reaſon.—Your ſecond ſection affords many inſtances of this ſophiſtical ſtratagem.

SECTION

SECTION II.

IN this ſection you bring forward the buſineſs of tithes, a moſt ſerious ſubject, and the grand ſubject which you profeſs to treat. But inſtead of fairly ſtating the queſtion, you go aſide, and ſet up the charge of extortion as the point in debate. On this ground, my Lord, a triumph was eaſy. The antiquity of tithes, their eſtabliſhment by the law of the land, a proviſion in this law making it impoſſible to exact more than the value of the tithe, are points which naturally lead to a clear and pretty reaſoning, in the ſequel of which, even the miſcreant crew of Proctors, Tithe-Farmers and Canters, are brought off with flying colours. Thoſe who conſider your Lordſhip's arguments as ſo many demonſtrations, muſt here expreſs their ſurpriſe and indignation, at the general and conſtant outcry of the people againſt perſons and things ſo inoffenſive and ſo harmleſs. For my part, accuſtomed as I am to pay great deference to the voice of the people, more eſpecially when they ſpeak from their natural feelings, I no ſooner heard of your demonſtrations, than I ſet them down as falſe, deeming it impoſſible that the judgment of the people could in this caſe be wrong. On inveſtigation, I think I have ſeen the fallacy of your reaſoning, and ſhall now, as well as I am able, point it out.

My Lord, the queſtion is not about that which no man controverts; about the legality of tithes, the antiquity of the eſtabliſhment, &c. The queſtion is, whether this eſtabliſhment, ſo ancient, ſo uni-

verſal, ſo ſtrongly ſanctioned by ſtatute law, be not a grievance, and the neareſt grievance which oppreſſes that moſt uſeful and oppreſſed part of the community, the tillers of the earth. The antiquity which you aſcribe to the eſtabliſhment of tithes, I cannot admit. You trace it up to Conſtantine, the firſt Chriſtian Emperor. I can find no proof of it before the days of Charlemagne. It was this great Emperor who firſt eſtabliſhed tithes. He lived in a barbarous age, in which all things ſeemed in a ſtate of fluctuation.—That perfection to which the dealings and intercourſe of mankind are at preſent brought, by the various ſigns and ſubſtitutes univerſally agreed to, was then unknown; even the rent was paid in kind. In this ſtate of barbariſm, a blind zeal ſometimes induced the people to confer all the landed eſtates on the Clergy; at other times an hungry and rapacious ſoldiery, with as little ceremony, ſtripped the ſacred order of every thing.—Under ſuch circumſtances, the manner of ſupporting the Clergy, introduced by Charlemagne, ſeemed the moſt eligible, becauſe the leaſt liable to abuſe; but that the charge or tax for this ſupport ſhould be fixed to a tenth, and not to a twentieth or thirtieth part of the produce of the earth, was, I believe, from a reſpect and veneration for the law of Moſes, rather than from any fitneſs or neceſſity obſerved in the nature of things. For even then tithes ſeemed too heavy a burthen, and Charlemagne's project did not ſucceed at firſt. When the people conſented at laſt to pay the tithes, it was on condition that they might have a power of redeeming them; and the famous diviſion of the tithes into four parts, for the repairing of the churches; for the poor; for the Biſhop; and for the Clergy; manifeſtly proves, that the tenth part of the produce of the earth, for the ſupport of the Clergy alone

alone, would be an enormous burthen. If this reaſoning be juſt; if a twentieth inſtead of a tenth part be as much as the people can well afford, then a vaſt ſpace is left for litigations, vexations, and oppreſſions, between a twentieth part, which reaſon points out, and a tenth part, which the law allows. Hence the term extortion will not appear quite ſo abſurd as your Lordſhip would intimate, if any regard be paid to natural juſtice. Hence the tenderneſs and humanity of certain Clergymen will be eſtimated at a lower rate than your Lordſhip ſeems to wiſh. Hence the venerable tribe of Proctors, Tithe-Farmers, and Canters, will fall back to that infamy to which the public voice has long conſigned them.

But your Lordſhip takes upon you to prove, contrary to the general ſenſe of mankind, that tithes not only are not, but cannot be a burthen. This is one of thoſe points which you ſlightly touch upon; you argue, however, with the utmoſt confidence, and your arguments are curious indeed; they amount to this, the cottager, when he took the land at a certain rent, was perfectly aware that the tenth part of the produce, though raiſed by his labour, was due to the pariſh miniſter. If, therefore, the burthen of both rent and tithes be too heavy, it muſt be the fault of the tenant who promiſed too high a rent, or the fault of the landlord who exacted it.—And do you forget, my Lord, the logical maxim, "What "proves too much proves nothing." According to this mode of arguing, if, inſtead of the tithe, the two thirds or the half of the produce of the earth were allotted to the Clergy, the people ſhould not complain. If the burthen was too heavy, it muſt be the fault of the landlord or tenant; for at all events, it ſeems the Clergy muſt be faultleſs. In like manner, if a legiſlature im-

poſed on the people the heavieſt taxes which can poſſibly be conceived, if the people were timely appriſed of the matter, they ſhould not count it a grievance: for then landlord and tenant, before they entered into an agreement, were perfectly aware of what was due to the ſtate, and ſhould manage their buſineſs accordingly.—Such, my Lord, are the conſequences which flow from your arguments; conſequences which cannot bear the teſt of reaſon.

My Lord, I have ſaid that your compariſons are often unfair. We need go no farther to prove that aſſertion. You compare the miniſter's tithes to the landlord's eſtate. You ſay that the title which the incumbent of a pariſh has to the tithe of it, is ſimilar, and in many reſpects ſuperior, to that which the landed gentleman has to his eſtate. If this compariſon was founded in truth, it would admirably ſerve your purpoſe. Hence it would follow, that no power in the ſtate has a right to meddle with tithes; and that if an urgent neceſſity called for the protection of agriculture, the legiſlature ſhould begin with the landlords. Hence again the public odium ſhould be directed againſt the rack-rents, and not againſt the tithes.—My Lord, the dominion and the uſe of things are very different. The dominion ſuppoſes the proprietor of land entitled to do what he pleaſes with his property, to ſell, to beſtow, to alienate, &c. nor do I know how any power can, with equity, dictate to a loyal ſubject in the management of his property. The uſe of a thing allows no ſuch liberty; nor can it be conceived independent of that power which firſt ordained it. Theſe conſequences you admit in a note, though with ſeeming reluctance; but ſtill you retain and ſtrain hard for the principle, in order to prove that the rack-rents are the only cauſe of grievances, the exiſtence

iſtence of which no man can be found hardy enough to deny.

It is certain, that many and various cauſes jointly concur in producing the unexampled miſery of the poor of Ireland.—When we ſpeak of alleviating ſo general and ſo inveterate a diſtreſs, we ſhould point to thoſe cauſes which moſt generally and moſt immediately apply, and which are moſt capable of being removed.—Rack-rents are a very general cauſe of diſtreſs; but ſuch a cauſe cannot be directly removed by law. If we go farther, and look for the cauſe of rack-rents, we ſhall readily perceive, that the luxury diffuſed among us by our good neighbours, and the ſubſtraction of the means to ſupport it by their deteſtable monopoly, will account for this evil.—Neither can luxury be removed by law. Its progreſs may be checked, its baneful influence counteracted. If luxury has raiſed the rents of land, let the people be enabled to bear them. If this aid be not near, let the people be eaſed of another burthen, and to the granting of this relief the ſtate is fully competent.

That the full tenth part of the produce of the earth, though divided into four parts for different purpoſes, was conſidered, in its origin, as too heavy a burden, I have ſhewn above. That it has ever ſince appeared in the ſame light is manifeſt, I think, from the following conſiderations. In all parts of the Continent with which I am acquainted, and I have had my information from many, what is called tithe ſcarce ever amounts to a fifteenth, moſt generally not to a twentieth, and in many places is no more than a fiftieth part of the produce of the earth. In this kingdom, according to your Lordſhip's declarations, the Clergy never receive the full tithe; and the Clergy, my Lord, I ſpeak it without prejudice, have never been

been remarkable, in any country, for receding from their rights and emoluments, when theſe rights could be readily obtained.

To ſay that tithes are no burden, becauſe, if they be taken away, the rents will riſe in proportion, is abſurd and falſe. The ſame might be ſaid of any taxes, and who will ſay that taxes are never burdenſome? If tithes be ſuch an univerſal and ſalutary check over rents, what will account for the exorbitant riſe of land within theſe forty years paſt, while trade was on the decline? Tithes did not prevent this riſe, nor would they, if removed, occaſion ſuch another.—If avarice had been the univerſal cauſe which excited landlords to mercileſs exactions, it might with ſome ſhew of reaſon be ſaid, that if tithes were removed, the rents would riſe in proportion. The avaricious man coolly weighs and conſiders when and how he can add to his treaſure. With reflexion and with foreſight he exacts the laſt farthing.—For the honour of human nature I will not, neither will reaſon allow me to ſuppoſe ſuch a general cauſe of rack-rents. But if luxury be that univerſal cauſe, then can I with reaſon ſay, that luxury creates new appetites, new neceſſities, to which the beſt of minds are impelled to miniſter, without regarding the conſequences; that luxury has its degrees; and that when once it ſettles to a national ſtandard, it leaves room for humanity, benevolence, and generoſity to operate in benefiting mankind. It cannot, therefore, with juſtice be inferred, that a proportionable riſe of land will follow from a removal of tithes, as luxury, the true cauſe of rack-rents, has already ſpent its force.—But ſuppoſe ſuch a relation to ſubſiſt between rents and tithes. Suppoſe rents to riſe as tithes diminiſh, can it on a fair compariſon be ſaid, that the removal of tithes would be no alle-

viation?

viation?—The rent is a fixed price for land, agreed to by landlord and tenant, for a certain number of years, the ſhorteſt term being generally thirty-one years. During this period encouragement and rewards are held out to induſtry. If the firſt ten years be employed in improvements with little or no profit, twenty-one years remain for the grateful ſoil to make ample returns.—How different are tithes? They are not a price for land; they are a great ſhare of its produce, they are a part of the huſbandman's labour, and of the ſweat of his brow; they are not fixed, they increaſe in proportion to his toils, and thus controul the ſpirit and defeat the end of induſtry.—Such are the various inconveniences which attend this ancient mode of ſupporting the Clergy. And yet we may ſtill conſider tithes in a moſt unfavourable point of view. They fall with redoubled weight upon agriculture, ſince grazing lands have been freed from the burden.—This change in tithes has not eſcaped your Lordſhip's notice, nor the notice of thoſe who have appeared on your ſide. It has been argued againſt and condemned with vehemence: but as you have all confined yourſelves to the injuſtice and loſs ſuſtained by the Clergy, I may be allowed to confine myſelf to the diſtreſs brought on that moſt uſeful and numerous, though humble, part of the community, the tillers of the earth; and to the national calamities which have abundantly enſued.

Grazing has been long encouraged in this unhappy iſland, for reaſons very juſt and very patriotic no doubt.—To free grazing lands from the burthen of tithes, was to throw that burden, in ſome degree, upon agriculture; but this was not all the evil. The grazier, freed from paying tithes, became capable of paying a higher rent, and was never wanting to outbid the farmer.

The

The landlords, who required no ſuch inducement, were thus powerfully tempted to exact rack-rents. The unfortunate farmer bid high, promiſed, ſtruggled, and ſailed. Still attached to the buſineſs to which he was reared, he turned another ſide, began again, failed again, and at laſt fell into utter ruin.—Such has been the fate of our once happy farmers, who to hide their miſery and ſhame, have ſtole into the ſuburbs and outparts of cities and towns, there to paſs away life in the greateſt wretchedneſs that the ſun has ever witneſſed, unknown and forgotten. Our cities and towns are ſwoln by their numbers, but ſuch collections of the human ſpecies do not prove either an increaſe of population, or an increaſe of proſperity. They are in the political body ſo many morbid tumours, in which the ſalutary juices that other parts have been deprived of are vitiated and corrupted. The fertile plains of Ireland ſeem ſacred to the brute creation. The miſerable inhabitants, who are ſcattered over the land, ſee every reſpect and regard paid to the beaſts of the field; they know no more of them, and it is well if the folly of the Egyptians be not revived amongſt us!—The extenſive baneful influence of this depopulation and empoveriſhment on our arts and manufactures, on our foreign and domeſtic trade, on our civil and political proſperity, need not be mentioned.—Enough has been ſaid to ſhew, that tithes are too heavy a burden, full of vexations and oppreſſions, and extending widely in deſtructive conſequences. My Lord, to make the charge of extortion the ſubject of your ſecond ſection, was to throw a veil over things which could not be ſupported.

SECTION

SECTION III.

YOUR third ſection affords ſtill greater marks of the ſophiſtical ſtratagem to which I have alluded. Throughout all this ſection you are cloſely engaged with phantoms. You make great efforts to beat down an oppoſition, which your imagination has created, and after a long conteſt, you come off victorious as might be naturally expected.—You make the revenues of the parochial clergy the ſubject of debate. You pretend that the people complain of the riches of the clergy, as if the objections to tithes originated in ſuch complaints. You enter into minute calculations with mathematical accuracy, and the reſult is, that the net ſum of 133l. 6s. would be left for each clergyman if the national allotment were diſtributed in equal portions.—We may here obſerve, that biſhop's lands are left out of the *minute calculations*; that theſe lands produce a vaſt fund; that they were originally ſet apart for the poor, of whom biſhops were conſidered the truſtees. This inſtitution has antiquity to plead. Why pervert it? Why not mention it? Are we to be anſwered that charity begins at home? And that the left hand ſhould not know what the right hand doth? My Lord, you preſent to us only ſuch things as you think will ſerve your purpoſe. You draw a compariſon between our parochial appointments as you have ſtated them, and the incomes of foreign clergy. You take a ſurvey of Scotland, Holland, and Switzerland, and you find the clergy in all theſe countries much better provided

vided for than with us.—The unequal diſtribution of the clerical fund, being a point of ſome moment, is haſtily hurried over without any diſcuſſion; and you finiſh the ſection in aſking, what particular miſchief could enſue from the wealth of the clergy, as they make no worſe uſe of their riches than other people?—One thing, my Lord, in this inquiry ſeems to be in direct contradiction with what you had before laid down as a principle. You here ſet forth that the Catholic biſhops and ſecular clergy almoſt always ſupported their national princes againſt Papal encroachments; and in your firſt ſection you lay it down as a principle, that all the Catholic Biſhops in the world are mere tools of Papal power. My Lord, your memory muſt have failed you in this inſtance, or you had too great a reliance on the want of it in your readers.—As to the arguments, calculations, and facts contained in your third ſection, they are all wide of the queſtion, and of courſe go for nothing.

My Lord, the queſtion is not about the revenues of the clergy; about Scotland, Holland, or Switzerland. The queſtion is ſimply this; whether the tithes, as they ſtand at preſent in this kingdom, be not too heavy a burden, and a national grievance.—Thoſe who think ſo agree that a greater fund than the clergy draw from the tithes might be raiſed for their ſupport, without any ſhow of oppreſſion: and in this caſe, it muſt be a matter of ſurpriſe to the unprejudiced, how a clamour could be raiſed, on the part of the clergy, againſt a change in a mode of ſubſiſtance, which muſt be to them, of all others, the moſt diſagreeable. We are here led to a conſideration of what your Lordſhip paſſes over ſo lightly, the unequal diſtribution of the clerical fund.

My

My Lord, the inequality is too great for any reaſon to ſupport it. That a wretched curate ſhould be allowed but 50l. a year to ſupport himſelf and family during life, and the pampered dignitary ten or fifteen thouſand, cannot bear examination. And it may well be ſuppoſed, that the outcries and alarms againſt any change, or innovation whatſoever, are propagated only by thoſe who wallow in temporal luxuries under ſpiritual names, and who dread leſt the public eye might be directed, by a ſpirit of reform once begun, to thoſe excreſcences in church and ſtate, which ſtifle all ſpiritual ſentiments in their poſſeſſors, while they deprive thouſands of temporal ſubſiſtance.—Much may be ſaid, rejoins your Lordſhip, for a ſubordination of ranks amongſt the clergy as well as in the army or navy: true, my Lord; ſuch a ſubordination I admit, and incomes proportioned to different ranks I would not refuſe: but let not church livings exceed all proportion; let not the gaudy trappings of Eaſtern luxury ſurround the miniſters of the Goſpel, and invite the faſcinating train of worldly pleaſures, while the rugged paths of the vineyard of the Lord are deſerted, and the ſoil is left a prey to brambles and to thorns.

My Lord, the many queries in the concluſion of your third lecture tend only to ſhew that clergymen are not worſe than others. "Do they," demands your Lordſhip, "encourage vice more, "or national manufactures, and charity, leſs than "other men? My Lord, if I underſtand the Goſpel right, churchmen ſhould be very different from other men. They are called the light of the world, the ſalt of the earth; and theſe expreſſions, with many others of a ſimilar nature, which ſtand forward in holy writ, neceſſarily require from the miniſters of religion an indefatigable

gable zeal in teaching, in preaching, and in the practice of the pureſt morality; a zeal which alone can diffuſe the light of the Goſpel through all ranks, from the philoſopher and the courtier, to the peaſant and the ſlave.

If the want of a decent competency be a check to theſe great exertions; exorbitant wealth muſt totally remove them. It induces luxury, and invites the ſlothful, the luxurious, and the worldly into the vineyard of the Lord. It deadens all manly efforts of the ſoul, and moſt eſpecially overwhelms and abſorbs ſpiritual exertions.—The experience of ages bears teſtimony to what I ſay, and the voice of the Proteſtants of Ireland confirms it beyond diſpute. They loudly complain that the want of reſidence, and the want of exertions, are in an exact proportion to the greatneſs of incomes. Little more is known of the pampered dignitary than that he enjoys a good living.

My Lord, I have ſomewhat deviated from the queſtion. "The unequal diſtribution of the cle-"rical fund" is not the main point; but it ſeemed to me a point of ſome moment; I might have overlooked it, if a change, which muſt operate to the good of agriculture, to the good of the nation, and to the good of the clerical body, was not ſo violently and ſo unfairly oppoſed by thoſe who poſſeſs ſo great, and ſo unequal, a portion of the clerical fund, and who ſeem conſcious of the abuſe by their exceſſive outcries againſt the reform of diſtant abuſes.

My Lord, I have already ſtated the queſtion, and ſhewn that all your facts, and all your calculations, fall ſhort of it. We may, therefore, proceed to your fourth ſection.

SECTION

SECTION IV.

MY Lord, in the cloſe of your third ſection, you mention a charge of remiſſneſs brought againſt the eſtabliſhed clergy, on account of the few converts made to the Proteſtant religion. In the beginning of the ſame ſection the duties of churchmen are repreſented full of importance, and full of difficulty; but they are not explained with that accuracy which is neceſſary for information. Some of your Lordſhip's expreſſions are very general, very equivocal, and very incoherent. For inſtance, "to watch over, and extend the Pro-"teſtant intereſt," are expreſſions which often carried along with them, in this unhappy iſland, an idea of the rankeſt oppreſſion and injuſtice: "the danger of weakening the connexion of this "kingdom with Great Britain," is ſtill made a cover for plunder and rapine: "but to impreſs "on the minds of Proteſtants a Chriſtian ſpirit of "love to their fellow-citizens who differ from "them in religious opinions," is a phraſe ſo ſolitary, ſo helpleſs, and ſo forlorn, that it excited my pity.—I looked behind me and before me, to the right and to the left. My Lord, in no part of your pamphlet is there to be found a principle that can agree with or aſſiſt this evangelical maxim: all appears in ſtern oppoſition.—Was it then thrown out in order to render more odious thoſe hateful objects which it cannot reach!

The picture which your Lordſhip draws of Preſbyterians and of Catholics, renders their ſpeedy converſion to the eſtabliſhed religion a matter

matter of political neceſſity. Yet the enlightened ſtateſman, not liable to be dazzled by falſe colouring, would look for and require other ſervices from the clergy whom he pays. He would conſider the morals of the people; and if he were told that he muſt not miſtruſt the clergy; for that "the province of education was committed to their "care," he would naturally inquire, how did learning and morality ſtand? If he found them at a lower ebb in this kingdom than in any other country in Europe: how idle would it be to reſt the defence of the clergy on their dutiful and orderly demeanour? And to defy malice to contradict the fact! For let the fact be admitted, and it implies no more than what will aptly ſuit any other order of men in the community; even the lower order of mechanics. My Lord, the converſion of men to the eſtabliſhed religion, however political in its tendency, ſhould, I conceive, be attempted only by ſpiritual means. In the account which you give of the little progreſs hitherto made in this buſineſs, and of the future arrangements which promiſe ſucceſs, you leave all to the legiſlature, and you ſeem to relinquiſh all dependence on ſpiritual arms. The only obſtacles which you meet to the great work of converſion are of the temporal kind; you arrange them under the title of "defects in the ſettlement of the "church of Ireland:" and theſe defects you make the ſubject of your fourth ſection.

The firſt defect is the ſmall number of clergymen. By comparing our clergy with thoſe of England, and of the United Provinces, you ſhew that ours fall far ſhort of the neceſſary number: but your compariſon is as uſual unfair; you fix it not by the number of the flock, but by the number of acres; now, in Ireland, even abſtracting from the difference of population, it is well known

that

that many extenſive pariſhes are found without a Proteſtant inhabitant, and who will ſay that a church, a glebe, and a pariſh-miniſter are there neceſſary? My Lord, our clergy are in proportion to the number of the flock, much more numerous than thoſe of England or of the United Provinces.—The other obſtacles are the very "great "extent of many pariſhes, the univerſal want of "glebes; the prejudice of Catholics in refuſing to "accommodate Proteſtant clergymen with lodg-"ings; and the difference of language."—What mighty bars againſt the two edged ſword of the word! But, my Lord, you forgot that in our great cities and towns, not one of thoſe obſtacles is to be found, and yet the buſineſs of converſion is as ſlack as elſewhere.—It is true you mention other impediments on the part of Catholics; which you may deem general, but which your Lordſhip's bare aſſertion is not ſufficient to ſubſtantiate: Such as "their rooted prejudices, their ignorance, "their ſuperſtitious veneration of Prieſts to whom "they look up for abſolutions, &c." An impartial judge would not, on a fair trial, find more ignorance among Catholics than among Proteſtants. Would he find more prejudice? Reaſon I think as well as Chriſtianity will ſupport me in the aſſertion, that to ſee and to aſſent to the ſpeculative truths of religion is placed by the Almighty above the reach of human abilities, as a wholeſome check to human pride. Men of the ſublimeſt genius, and of the moſt conſummate learning, differ in points of faith, and he muſt be a miſerable bigot indeed, who can ſuppoſe that nothing but a want of information can make diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed church. I am far from tranſgreſſing the bounds of truth, when I ſay that in many countries of Europe are to be found men infinitely ſurpaſſing whatever Ireland can produce, and ſincerely

cerely attached to the Catholic and Preſbyterian communions. Human wiſdom is not therefore a ſure means of attaining divine light, and to whatever degree education may be improved, the converſion of Diſſenters may be as diſtant as ever. Oppreſſive and vexatious meaſures are ſo prepoſterous a mode of converting unbelievers, that they have always had a contrary effect. To cultivate and to diffuſe morality is the true means of attaining that end. It is thus that human paſſions, which obſcure divine truths, are removed, and the illiterate as well as the learned are drawn to the ſame light. If then we cannot be one people until we are of one religion, and if the eſtabliſhed religion be that true one: the clergy need only practiſe what they profeſs, and we ſhall ſoon arrive at that deſirable end. It is impoſſible, with all the advantages which the legiſlature holds out, that the cauſe of truth muſt not triumph over that of error, if the miniſters of true religion fulfil their duty. This duty, as I have already obſerved, is not an ordinary one. It ſuppoſes very active exertions, and the practice of virtues, which ſtrike the ſenſes, and arreſt the judgments of men.—Are the eſtabliſhed clergy to be known by theſe works?

The public have always been peculiarly indulgent to the ſacred order, and have often loſt ſight of the man in the reſpect due to his ſtation; for, in the ordinary courſe of human affairs, we are not wont to ſeparate the perſon from the office which he bears. The diſtinction is however neceſſary. Indeed if we cenſure a miniſter of religion, on account of his office, we cenſure the office itſelf, and are guilty of impiety: but if he neglects the duties of his ſtation, and perverts the principles which he profeſſes; we then ſhould arraign him through a regard for his office. To overlook his

faults

faults would be to desert the cause of religion. At all events our condition would be most hard, if a set of men, who are thought to be very liable to censure, were at liberty to defame the great body of the people of Ireland, while no notice was to be taken of their pursuits, as if their vices as well as their profession were to be held in veneration. The only difficulty which occurs to my mind on the occasion is, that some worthy characters may be hurt by any thing like a general charge; and yet if my censures appear general, or bordering on general, the public will, I trust, acquit me of illiberality, when it is remembered, that the unparalleled slanders, falsehoods, and invectives of the spurious Theophilus, are in substance adopted by the Bishop of Cloyne, by the Dean and Chapter of St. Patricks, by the Dean and Chapter of Christ's Church, by Trinity College; for so the many publications issuing from that famous Lyceum testify; and that these slanders are supported by numbers of the established clergy in many other parts of the kingdom: the most exceptionable pamphlets being distributed gratis with uncommon assiduity by churchmen, and by persons deriving under churchmen, as looking up to them.

My Lord, if Christian humility could not induce, at least human prudence should have directed, the established clergy not to throw aside a veil of obscurity, which must have been to them a friendly shade. When your Lordship and the many pious scribes who have appeared on your side hurled defiance in our teeth, and then suppose that the character of the clergy cannot be impeached; did you imagine that such an appeal

would convince the public againſt the evidence of their ſenſes; or that the thanks of the Dean and Chapter of St. Patrick's, voted to your Lordſhip for doing what you did not do, would blindfold the nation? My Lord, what is glaring and ſelf-evident requires no proof; or the only proof which could be given on this ſubject, that of particularizing perſons and things, cannot be attempted with propriety. It is ſufficient, at leaſt for the preſent time, that there are almoſt as many living witneſſes as inhabitants in Ireland, who ſee ſo much of the lives and purſuits of the eſtabliſhed clergy as will abundantly criminate thoſe paſtors of ſouls at the tribunal of reaſon. Your Lordſhip aſſerts that they are not worſe than other men. I have already ſhewn that if they be not better they are deficient. But are they not worſe than other men? Without dwelling on the vices which revolt natural reaſon, and which Pagan philoſophy would reprobate: though much might be ſaid on that head too; let us turn to thoſe ſublime virtues which the Goſpel inculcates, and which give to Chriſtianity its diſtinctive marks.—Who are ſo eſtranged from thoſe virtues as the eſtabliſhed clergy? Humility, forbearance, and meekneſs; the love of our enemies, a ſpirit of forgiveneſs, charity, purity of mind, a *ſacred regard to truth*, ſelf-denial, and that unabating deſire of becoming all things to all men.—Are ſuch virtues known among the eſtabliſhed clergy? Will the voice of the nation aver it? Will the voice of the Proteſtants of Ireland admit it? Will thoſe ſpiritual guides themſelves acknowledge it? Or will the fruits of their labours warrant it?—The beſt account that can be given of theſe diſciples of Chriſt is, that ſome of them ſit down in the full, ſilent,

ſilent, and peaceable enjoyment of the good things of this life. If they labour what are their works? Or what relation do they bear to the Goſpel? I could point out more Chriſtianity in the works of Seneca or Tully.—Contempt, hatred, indignities, aukward ſneers, miſrepreſentations, and falſehoods, make up the whole of the numberleſs alarms, dreams, conſiderations, plans for extending the Proteſtant intereſt, antidotes againſt Popery, &c. &c. which year after year inſult our underſtandings, and in which clerical aſperity is not blunted even by an exceſs of dullneſs. An open violation of that awful interdict: THOU SHALT NOT BEAR FALSE WITNESS, cannot ſhock when it is ſo eaſily excuſed by a certain degree of warmth, which is ever inſeparable from zeal in a good cauſe. In the courſe of thoſe ſpiritual compoſitions the temporal ſword is conſtantly appealed to, the moſt tyrannical meaſures are adviſed; and every idea of the natural rights of mankind is loſt in the fulneſs of bigotry.—My Lord, I bluſh for the miniſters of religion, I feel for human nature, when I reflect that their publications are peculiarly marked with calumny and falſehood.—The very name of Biſhop Burnet excites the idea of fiction; and Archbiſhop King calling on the God of truth to witneſs what the world knows he knew to be falſe, gives the deepeſt dye to human depravity. Have the fellow-labourers and ſucceſſors of theſe worthy prelates deviated from their example? My Lord, this falſifying practice is a great obſtacle to the progreſs of the Proteſtant religion. It diſguſts all Proteſtants of information, of candour, and of honeſty, and it is an inſuperable bar to the converſion of Catholics. The moſt unread among them inſtant-

ly take the alarm, and make a compariſon by no means favourable to the progreſs of the Proteſtant religion.—" That cauſe," ſay they, " muſt " be bad which requires ſuch ſupport, and they " muſt wiſh evil to us who thus belie us. We " do not act ſo by them. When we oppoſe them, " we do not force doctrines and tenets upon them " which they diſclaim. We do not pretend to " know their creed better than they do themſelves: and when we ſpeak of their paſt conduct " we appeal to their own hiſtorians."

My Lord, the education of youth affords the faireſt opportunity of diffuſing morality; and to diffuſe morality is the great means of propagating true religion, and of rendering eſſential ſervice to the ſtate. The province of education, your Lordſhip boaſts, is committed to the care of the clergy: but how is it carried on? or what uſe is made of the immenſe funds allotted for that purpoſe in many parts of the kingdom? My Lord, we behold the clergy in the education of youth, as in the functions of their miniſtry, either doing nothing, or worſe than nothing. That bigotry, which has been the ruin and diſgrace of this unhappy country, originates with the clergy. It makes a great part of that ſyſtem of education which " they " ſuperintend with ſo much honour to themſelves, " and with ſo much advantage to the public." From the ſupercilious profeſſor of Trinity College, to the undefinable ſophiſt of a charter-ſchool, the principle prevails, of miſrepreſenting, of calumniating, and of dealing impious frauds. " If this " mode of education requires not ſome prudent " regulation," I know not what does. It were better have no fixed plan of education than ſuch an one.

My

My Lord, the fourth ſection ends in a very gloomy and foreboding manner. Popery gaining ground on all ſides! The Proteſtant religion giving way to Popery, till it be totally extinguiſhed, and all this in conſequence of a change in the revenues of the clergy.—So, my Lord, it is by revenues only the Proteſtant religion is ſupported. How does Popery, as you politely call it, maintain its ground? The Catholic clergy poſſeſs no revenues; perhaps they make uſe of magical ſpells. How then does Preſbyterianiſm ſtand? For neither do the Preſbyterian clergy poſſeſs any revenues.—I might here form a train of very curious deductions, and ſhew, with at leaſt as much evidence as your Lordſhip boaſts of, that it is by revenues the Proteſtant intereſt is weakened. For if the Proteſtant clergy have family, education, learning, genius, and truth on their ſide, with great revenues; and if the clergy of other perſuaſions want all theſe advantages, and have no revenues; we may, in ſuch a caſe, ſuppoſe that, if the other perſuaſions keep their ground, it is becauſe their clergy have no revenues; and that, if the Proteſtant religion makes no progreſs, it is becauſe the Proteſtant clergy are incumbered with revenues. This I advance to ſhew, how eaſy it would be to fill a pamphlet with deductions very different from, and full as evident as thoſe of your Lordſhip.

My Lord, the buſineſs of converſion is quite romantic and viſionary. But were we even to look to it as to a probable event, I have pointed out the only means by which this end can be attained. I have ſhewn that the Proteſtant clergy do not uſe theſe means; I have ſhewn that they

are deficient in exertions. They neglect the morals of the people, and perhaps their own are not the beſt. The means which they employ to extend the Proteſtant intereſt are of an immoral and unchriſtian kind, and muſt of courſe be either ineffectual, or pernicious in their conſequences. Theſe, my Lord, are " the true defects in the ſet-" tlement of the church of Ireland," and theſe your Lordſhip has completely overlooked,

SECTION

SECTION V.

MY Lord, your fifth ſection contains not leſs than twenty pages; but as its length is occaſioned by the ſpinning out of futilities, I may ſpare myſelf the trouble of following your Lordſhip, and content myſelf with breaking through your cobweb-tales by ſome general reflections.

My Lord, a fundamental fault, obſervable through your whole pamphlet, is very glaring in your fifth ſection. "You prove too much, and "of courſe you prove nothing." My Lord, were we to repeat any plan or meaſure on account of the many minute circumſtances which metaphyſical poſſibilities might ſuggeſt againſt it, a fatal pyrrhoniſm would ſoon ſeize us, and the world would ſink into perfect inaction.

In the fifth ſection you profeſs to treat of commutation; and you ſet out by placing beyond the reach of doubt the ſtrange principles advanced in the former ſections, and yet theſe principles can never riſe, in an unprejudiced mind, to the loweſt degree of doubt.—You then ſlightly glance at a few inconveniences attending tithes in general; but you object to the term tax as applied to tithes. A long note is employed to ſhew that tithes are not a tax, You define a tax to be a portion of the ſubject's property, levied by law for the public uſe; now, reſumes your Lordſhip, tithes of the produce

produce of the earth, though raiſed by the farmer's induſtry, is not his property, for it was not his landlord's. Softly, my Lord, the rent of the land is a ſmall conſideration in the produce of it. What of the hire of labourers? The price and feeding of cattle employed for cultivation? Manure? The labour of the huſbandman, and the ſweat of his brow? And if theſe things be not his property, I know not what is. "But the portion of tithes paid to the miniſter of a pariſh is "not levied for a public uſe; for he is retained "to perform religious ſervices for the inhabitants "of that particular pariſh only, and ſhould be "paid by thoſe whom he ſerves." The bare mention of this argument is ſufficient to ſhew to what quirks and quiddities your Lordſhip is reduced. Indeed your laſt propoſition, "that the "pariſh miniſter ſhould be paid by thoſe whom "he ſerves," muſt have eſcaped you unawares; for it leads to a diſquiſition which would ſhew, that tithes carry along with them in this kingdom an indelible idea of injuſtice and oppreſſion.—Reaſon led your Lordſhip to aſſert, that "the pa"riſh miniſter ſhould be paid by thoſe whom "he ſerves:" You thus intimate, that the Proteſtant inhabitants of other pariſhes had no right to pay him, as payment ſuppoſed ſome value received. The ſame reaſon ſays more forcibly, that the Preſbyterians and Catholics of any pariſh have no right to pay a Proteſtant miniſter, as they receive nought from him, ſave in many inſtances calumny and contempt. My Lord, that active ſenſe of right and wrong, ſo deeply implanted in our nature, that original and natural juſtice, which no ſtatute can efface, no conſtitution do away, ſhould have ſome weight in the breaſt of a Biſhop.

Through

Through all the mazy rounds which you traverſe in favour of tithes, we hear nothing of this great principle.—Indeed you ſpeak of Diſſenters rejecting the ſervice of a Clergyman, as if they were obliged to pay for what they reject; and to get rid entirely of the troubleſome queſtion, you refer us entirely to your ſecond ſection. All we here find is, that if the ſtate paid the Clergy of any other ſect, that ſect would be eſtabliſhed. This, my Lord, requires proof, and the words eſtabliſhed religion and eſtabliſhment ſhould, but have not been defined with accuracy and preciſion. The looſe manner in which your Lordſhip has wielded theſe big words, would make them applicable to the moſt extenſive aſſertion of tyranny.—Your alluſion to the Emperor's conduct is unfair. It is unfair in drawing compariſons to confine the view to certain parts. Compariſons ſhould be whole and entire; and if they were ſo in this inſtance, how different would the Great Joſeph's Lutheran ſubjects appear from the harraſſed and proſcribed Catholics and Preſbyterians of Ireland! But there is a difference in this reſpect, between Ireland and every other country upon earth, as the Reverend and liberal Mr. Barber very well obſerves. In all other countries the ſtate religion is the religion of the great body of the people, and therefore alters the plea of partial evil for univerſal good. In Ireland the ſtate religion is the religion of the few; and, according to your Lordſhip's principles, moſt unequivocally holds out univerſal evil for partial good; a maxim which mocks every idea of juſtice, of good government, and of ſound policy.—No reaſon will here diſcountenance this inference at leaſt, that if Preſbyterians and Catholics muſt be taxed

for

for the ſupport of a Clergy who do not belong to them, the mode of taxation ſhould be made as agreeable and as eaſy as poſſible. Your Lordſhip keeps clear of ſuch idle conſiderations. Through the whole tenor of your pamphlet, the principle, Whatever is is right, conſtantly occurs wherever the conduct or revenues of the eſtabliſhed Clergy are concerned, and cuts ſhort all difficulties.

In the former ſections a reduction in the revenues of the Clergy is repreſented big with miſchief, as eſſentially involving the ruin of religion, the downfall of the conſtitution; and all evils, foreign as well as domeſtic, are held forth as ſo many ſpontaneous conſequences of ſuch an unhallowed attempt. In the preſent ſection, ſtrange to tell! Commutation is ſurrounded with as great evils, and with conſequences equally tremendous. We are preſented with "a chaos of confuſion! "The whole kingdom in a ſtate of abeyance! "An awful period of ſuſpenſe! A pauſe of all "tranſactions, in which land is concerned! All "parties injured! Confounded! Complaining! "And a century requiſite to bring any new regu- "lation to ſuch a degree of legal clearneſs and "notority, as that of the preſent tithe laws, &c. "&c. &c." Bleſs me, muſt here exclaim, the man of ſober and common ſenſe; how wonderful are the ways of the Clergy! When human wiſdom can deviſe for them no other ſupport than that of tithes; without ſubverting all order, unhinging all property, and throwing the world into utter confuſion. What more can be wanting to demonſtrate the eſtabliſhment of tithes *jure divino?* —If all ſtates have, in all ages, amply provided for

for the different order of officers whom they employed. If no claſs of the community have had ſo little cauſe of complaint, through all the changes which have happened in the value of money, in the degree of commerce, in the manners of people. All this proves nothing. They were profane mortals, and conſequently depended on, and were ſubject to, the temporal power. But the Clergy derive their tithes, as well as their miſſion, from a higher ſource. No wonder then, that the impious interference of human power ſhould be attended with the moſt dire effects!

Seriouſly, my Lord, were we to lay any ſtreſs on your *inſuperable difficulties*, we can no longer conceive, not only how the *few diſtricts inhabited by the Preſbyterian ſect* (and your Lordſhip might have added the Catholic Kingdoms of Poland and Bohemia) can ſupport their Clergy without tithes; but even how a ſingle inſtance of ſuch a nature could occur in the hiſtory of mankind. And yet the eſtabliſhed Clergy are, I believe, on a more regular footing in thoſe countries where tithes are aboliſhed than elſewhere. There fewer complaints are heard from the people. The Clergy are not ſo liable to worldly embarraſſments, and the boundaries of their rights are more exactly aſcertained. A commutation is then practicable, as it has been practiſed with ſucceſs; and the many peccadilloes affixed by your Lordſhip to the only plans which you thought proper to mention, would equally militate againſt the moſt rational ſyſtems ever deviſed, if theſe ſyſtems were to be managed by your Lordſhip, to be ſtripped of all collateral ſupport, and their weak ſides only to be expoſed to view.

The

The general uſe of tithes through the Chriſtian world during ſo many centuries, is ſet forth by your Lordſhip with great parade. The ſeveral ſtates are ſpecified, they are called "wiſe ſtates, "poliſhed nations, the moſt enlightened in the "world. Theſe ſtates ſtill continue tithes; even "the reformation of Luther made no change in "that eſtabliſhment. Either, therefore, we muſt "conceive that all thoſe ſtates, the moſt enlight-"ened in the world, have remained for ages in "one palpable pernicious blunder, through mere "chance and inattention; or the wiſeſt legiſla-"tures have hitherto deemed it an inſuperable "difficulty to deviſe a ſubſtitute liable to ſo little "objection."—This formidable dilemma ſtrikes at firſt view; but it falls to the ground on the ſlight-eſt acquaintance with the nature and hiſtory of man.

Mankind we know readily became ſlaves to cuſtom. The greateſt hardſhips are by cuſtom made ſmooth and eaſy; nay, the ways to which we are accuſtomed, though reaſon may deem them unnatural and unpleaſant, are often preferred to thoſe which nature points out, and to which plea-ſure invites. No wonder then that the moſt ſim-ple and peaceable part of the community ſhould acquieſce in bearing a burden to which they might think themſelves born. But would not legiſlators and ſtateſmen remove ſuch a burden if prejudi-cial to agriculture? And ſo, my Lord, legiſlators and ſtateſmen always conſult the real intereſt of the ſtate, and the happineſs of the people.—Would to God we could ſay ſo, and Ireland would be, at this day, a ſtranger to many other grievances beſide tithes. But ſuppoſe virtue and wiſdom

wiſdom equally conjoined in ſtateſmen; ſuppoſe them ready to adopt the meaſure of aboliſhing tithes, what a complicated oppoſition might they not expect from powerful and intereſted bodies, as well as individuals, in thoſe celebrated countries to which your Lordſhip has pointed. My Lord, the oppoſition would be the more formidable to any ſtateſman, as it would be carried on by the moſt ſubtle, intriguing, and dangerous part of the community.—Whatever cauſes may be aſſigned for the exiſtence and continuance of great and general abuſes, it is certain, that ſuch evils may be obſerved in the wiſeſt ſtates, and in the moſt enlightened ages.—Without looking far back, or impeding our progreſs with many examples, I ſhall only glance at the conduct of the preſent Emperor of Germany. He has ſpent a great part of his reign in reforming abuſes, which had antiquity and univerſality to plead, and which muſt appear to your Lordſhip as grievous and burdenſome.—Yet theſe abuſes have long continued in enlightened times; many of them ſtill ſubſiſt in the moſt poliſhed nations, and under the wiſeſt ſtates; while no man can aſſert, that a removal of them would be attended with fatal conſequences, or that a proper commutation could not be made where a reſervation might be neceſſary.—What, my Lord, ſhould we ſay of Popery itſelf, that compound of ignorance, of ſuperſtition, and of cruelty; that cloud which darkeneth true religion and true ſcience? (Such is the picture which the late publications exhibit of the Catholic religion.) This Popery, my Lord, which the ſimple enriching and multiplying of the Proteſtant Clergy would baniſh out of Ireland, as the ſolar rays would expel a noxious vapour, is ſtill continued in, nay,

is the religion of thoſe ſtates which your Lordſhip ſtiles the wiſeſt and moſt enlightened upon earth. Theſe wiſe ſtates muſt then "have re-"mained for ages in one palpable pernicious "blunder, through mere chance and inatten-"tion."

My Lord, we muſt ſtill think that tithes are a very awkward, and a very exceptionable mode of ſupporting the Clergy in any country; but moſt eſpecially in Ireland, where the great body of the people have their own beſides the eſtabliſhed Clergy to maintain: where the low ſtate of agriculture, the want of commerce, the poverty of the peaſantry, with abſentees, middle-men, and rack-rents, hanging upon their ſhoulders, make other burdens deſtructive and intollerable. Beſides, Ireland is, I believe, the only country in which tithes are not fixed to a determinate ſtandard; and in which ſuch ample ſcope is given to the unrelenting rapacity of Proctors, Tithe-Farmers, and Canters.—Theſe obvious truths will ever remain unſhaken in an unprejudiced mind, notwithſtanding the dreadful horrors which you attribute to commutation, and the many airy perfections in which you dreſs up tithes, the barbarous offspring of dark ages.—In viewing theſe perfections, I could ſcarce withhold a ſmile, when, among other things very handſomely adjuſted, I ſaw explained how tithes are the moſt effective method of inſuring reſidence. My Lord, if we were to judge from facts, we ſhould conclude the reverſe. It is impoſſible that non-reſidence could be more common than it is at preſent, under any other poſſible mode of ſupporting the Clergy. If reſidence be not enforced by ſpiritual means,

a ſimple

a ſimple increaſe of income will never effect it. Our abſentee landlords have the ſame motive in a much higher degree; but other cauſes more forcible and more powerful prevail; and it may be, with all due deference, preſumed, that the Clergy are not ſtrangers to the bewitching influence of ſimilar cauſes.

SECTION

SECTION VI.

MY LORD, your ſixth ſection treats of *the bad effects of innovation on either plan;* and preſents us with ſtill more alarming and ruinous proſpects; with ſuch national confuſion and ruin, as *nothing but the neceſſity of alarming the public could induce you to delineate.* Patience, ye Logicians! if numberleſs looſe concluſions perplex your minds.

My Lord, among many dreadful conſequences which any kind of reduction or commutation would occaſion, you ſay, "it would reduce the "Proteſtant Clergy in point of education, rank, "and influence; by ſhutting up many churches, "it muſt rapidly diminiſh the power of Church-"men, and, at the ſame time, by raiſing in the "like proportion the number and influence of the "Romiſh Prieſts, &c. with the animation of hope "and foreign aſſiſtance overturn the Proteſtant "aſcendancy."—The expreſſions, "by raiſing in "the like proportion the number and influence of "the Romiſh Prieſts," are not clear to me. If they mean, that the remedying of grievances would encreaſe population, and relieve the diſtreſſed, and that ſuch ſhocking evils might add to the number and ſupport of the Romiſh Clergy, we may clearly perceive a link of that chain of tyranny which pervades your entire pamphlet, and which you endeavour to conceal from public view.—The hope of foreign aſſiſtance is advanced by

by your Lordſhip with your uſual candour and liberality. What ſays the man of reaſon? He muſt ſtrangely wonder, how artful conſpirators againſt church and ſtate could ſo prepoſterouſly chuſe their time, and ſo unaccountably reject the occaſion which openly courted their favourite ſcheme! It muſt be within your Lordſhip's recollection, for it is within the period of a very few years, when the united fleets of the Houſe of Bourbon appeared on our coaſts, and gave law to both the Channels. The moſt ignorant of thoſe very ignorant Papiſts, whom your Lordſhip would enlighten by taxation and oppreſſion, were perfectly aware, that there was nothing in the Britiſh Empire capable of withſtanding that power. They had only to beckon from the beach, foreign aſſiſtance was at hand; they had only to ſtand neuter, and the buſineſs was done. They forgot their principle of erecting their religious eſtabliſhment, and of reviving their ancient claims.— They ſtood forth, and they alone * preſerved Ireland for their Sovereign. The Biſhop of Cloyne had not as yet proved them to be perjurers, not entitled to national confidence. Nor had Mr. Browne of the College read to them his Lecture upon Modeſty. But acts of magnanimity, generoſity, and diſintereſtedneſs, are thrown away upon bigots!

Still new ſources of tremendous evils appear. Any innovation whatſoever " would leſſen the

* It is by no means intended to take from the merits of every other deſcription of Iriſhmen. The above paſſage implies no more, than that the Catholics, from their ſuperior numbers, had it in their power to turn the ſcale whatever ſide they inclined.

" connexion between this kingdom and England;
" it would prevent Engliſhmen from veſting anew,
" or continuing an intereſt in Iriſh lands."—Where is the proof, my Lord? Indeed we are not to look for proofs in this ſection. The leading aſſertions which it contains, are quite oppoſite to the dictates of reaſon, to the rights of mankind, and to the maxims of good government; and from theſe aſſertions ariſes a tiſſue of declamation, well ſuited to a mind in which the natural courſe of cauſes and effects is perverted by bigotry.—What if ſuch a change, namely, in the manner of ſupporting the Clergy, ſhould take place in England? Reaſon tells me, though it did not take place in England, that it ſhould be effected in Ireland. The people of England are the moſt oppulent in the world, a pampered people; the people of Ireland are the moſt wretched; of courſe, what proves an intollerable burden to the latter, may not be felt by the former. Your Lordſhip's reaſon turns another ſide; the unexampled miſery of Iriſhmen touches you not; you ſee no rank of people oppreſſed, aggrieved, or empoveriſhed, in this ill-fated land but the eſtabliſhed Clergy. " The Church of England, you ſay, is complete-
" ly ſettled, the Church of Ireland is ſcarce half
" advanced towards a ſettlement." Now if the clerical fund of one province in Ireland ſurpaſſeth that of the entire kingdom of Scotland, where will this ſettlement end? But I ſhould recollect, that you have already proved it impoſſible that tithes can be a burden: let then every thing be tithed according to the original wide definition of the term, and perhaps your Lordſhip may happily approach to a complete ſettlement of the Church of Ireland.—" The great body of the people of

" England

" England are of the eſtabliſhed Church; the great " body of the people of Ireland diſſent from it." Therefore, would I ſay, the number of the eſtabliſhed Clergy ſhould be leſs in Ireland, and the clerical fund leſs in proportion. No, ſays the Biſhop of Cloyne, but the number of Clergymen and the clerical fund ſhould be increaſed in proportion; " for otherwiſe the national Church " would be checked in its progreſs."—My Lord, how this concluſion agrees with that ſpirit of Chriſtian toleration which you profeſs, is not eaſily perceived. It is true, this mode of propagating true religion does not immediately effect life or limb, it goes not to the cutting off of ears, or the ſlitting of noſes; but it very materially affects the property of the Catholics and Preſbyterians of this kingdom. If the progreſs of the true religion can only advance in an exact proportion to the increaſe of the clerical fund, and if this increaſe is to be for the moſt part levied on the Catholics and Preſbyterians, who will preſcribe limits to your Lordſhip's zeal? May it not ſuggeſt, that the parting with every thing here below, is a ſure means of being converted to the light of Heaven? —" The laſt dreadful conſequence of innovation," ſays your Lordſhip, " would be its fatal operation " on the great ſeminary of learning, from which " this kingdom derives ſo much credit and ad- " vantage."

We are now to behold learning, as we have already ſeen religion, entirely upheld by vaſt funds ſet apart for its Profeſſors. Thoſe funds we are not to confound with the munificent rewards by which the Mecenaſes of different ages have excited the emulation, and crowned the la-

bours of literary adventurers. The munificent rewards ſeldom fail of ſplendid ſucceſs; while the funds appear quite different in their effects, as well as in their nature. They are not the rewards of merit, they are fixed permanent appointments, generally attained by arts, to which true genius can never ſtoop. The paſſing through certain academical forms may be a neceſſary condition; but how eaſily merit can be diſpenſed with in ſuch proceedings, is too well underſtood. Again, vaſt appointments, even when they fall by chance to men of merit and genius, are known to deaden that active energy of mind in the profeſſors of learning, as well as in the miniſters of religion, upon which the value of either entirely depends. If examples be required, we need not go from home, nor carry our view beyond "that great ſe-"minary of learning, from which this kingdom "derives ſo much credit and advantage."

Panegyricks on Trinity College are very frequent in this kingdom, but are never heard in any other country upon earth. They are uttered by thoſe who, in praiſing that College, praiſe themſelves. Judgment, therefore, ſhould pauſe, and wait for proofs before it decides.—For my part, I candidly avow, that I have never been able to diſcover proper grounds for panegyrick in any thing which virtue or ſcience may have derived from Trinity College.—We have enjoyed an uninterrupted peace of near a century. Trinity College is the moſt amply endowed of any other College in Europe, The Muſes wanted no inducement to viſit our clime; and yet Ireland has gained the opprobrious name of Bæotia. Our good neighbours tell the world that we naturally

want

want intellects as well as courage, but the *perſecuted* and exiled Iriſh have conſtantly ſupported, under vaſt difficulties, a literary as well as military fame on the moſt conſpicuous ſtages in Europe. If Trinity College be not anſwerable for the want of the former at home, I know not what is: and until Mr. Brown offers us ſomething more ſubſtantial, than the ſilly rhapſody with which he amuſed us laſt ſeſſion, we muſt think and acknowledge, that the Britiſh Univerſities do not tranſgreſs the bounds of truth or juſtice, when they ſarcaſtically point to their dull and dumb ſiſter.—Indeed, if proſcribing all thoſe who do not ſubſcribe to the thirty-nine articles, from the means of improving their rational faculties; if miſrepreſenting the tenets, and vilifying the character of non-conformiſts, are the means of ſupporting the Proteſtant religion; this *learned* ſeminary has not ſwerved from the purpoſe for which your Lordſhip ſays it was founded. But at the ſame time it may be preſumed, that the habitual practice of thoſe *pious* works, the exceſſive ſalaries of the College, the enormous eccleſiaſtical benefices, to which ſenior members retire, contract and blunt, and render ineffectual what the world commonly calls Genius.—This concluſion is not diſproved by the almoſt only productions which iſſue from this religious Lyceum; in them we conſtantly obſerve groſs miſrepreſentation and contemptible arrogance, accompanied with inſipidity, dulneſs, and a ſtrange weakneſs of reaſoning. Many publications of this kind, in the form of pamphets, (for bigger forms might take too much from pleaſure and eaſe) have preceded and followed your Lordſhip's wonderful performance. They are in general too ſcurrilous in ſtyle, and too flimſy in ſubſtance,

ſtance for any ſerious mention. The leaſt exceptionable one, lately publiſhed in aid of your Lordſhip's doctrines, by the Rev. Mr. Burrowes, Fellow of Trinity College, I ſhall take ſome notice of.

Mr. Burrowes attempts to refute Mr. Barber, and decrees himſelf a triumph while no ſign of victory appears. He accuſes Mr. Barber of "publiſhing a pamphlet dangerous to the peace of "the nation, tending to exaſperate the minds of "men, and to breed popular diſcontent:" and he applauds and joins iſſue with thoſe publications which revile and vilify the great body of the people. I would aſk Mr. Burrowes in what part of the natural hiſtory of man has he diſcovered, that contemptuous and reproachful language tends to produce contentment, cordiality, and affection?—Mr. Barber ſays nothing of the outrages in the South; and well might he have ſpared himſelf the trouble of the many exaggerated and direful accounts held forth to the public: Mr. Burrowes concludes that he abets thoſe outrages. The Biſhop of Cloyne, Mr. Burrowes, and their learned aſſociates, paſs over unnoticed the unexampled wretchedneſs of the Iriſh peaſantry, the cauſes of this wretchedneſs, and the ſufferings of the Catholic clergy in the late outrages. *A pari*, may we not conclude that the Biſhop of Cloyne, Mr. Burrowes, and their learned aſſociates are abettors of thoſe evils?—The Biſhop of Cloyne had laid down the ſtrange poſition, that the preſent church eſtabliſhments, with all their inequalities and all their abuſes, are eſſential to the very exiſtence of our civil conſtitution, and of the eſtabliſhed religion: Mr. Barber denies the poſition,

and

and points out the many evils which have flowed from ſuch eſtabliſhments; Mr. Burrowes hence concludes, that he proves beyond a doubt the truth of the Biſhop's concluſion, namely, "that "the Preſbyterians are levellers, who would pull "down the conſtitution in church and ſtate *per* "*fas atque nefas.*" A very wide concluſion, that leads very far! And Doctor BUTLER, by diſtinguiſhing between the ſpirit and letter of an oath, demonſtratively proves that the Catholic religion countenances perjury! Good again Mr. Burrowes. And ſo Mr. Burrowes human language is ſo perfectly accurate as to need no explanation! and human minds are ſo perfectly illumined as to leave no obſcurity, either in the formation of language, or in the formation of oaths. Muſt not the very terms of oaths, which all nations ſeem ſo fond of preſerving inviolate, become nugatory by common conſent, when through lapſe of time the objects to which they firſt applied have either vaniſhed, or given way to new objects! And hence will not a diſtinction between the letter and ſpirit of an oath, as well as the letter and ſpirit of a law, often become neceſſary? If Mr. Burrowes's remark had any weight, how many of thoſe ſworn into places and offices in this kingdom would be free from perjury? But Mr. Burrowes's *ingenious* reaſoning was only intended for Popery: to apply it to what Mr. Burrowes ſuppoſes endowed with perfection is not the part of a loyal ſubject.—Mr. Burrowes in his fifth page aſſerts, that before Mr. Barber's remarks appeared, a great majority of the inhabitants of this kingdom ~~were~~ *well affected:* and in his ſeventh page he ſets down, as incontrovertible, the Biſhop of Cloyne's concluſion: that the members of the

eſtabliſhed

eſtabliſhed church alone can be *cordial* friends to the conſtitution of this realm.—Such contradictory aſſertions ſhould have been placed at a greater diſtance.—When Mr. Burrowes meant to defend the temporalities of Churchmen, he ſhould have ſpecified the extent of the word eſtabliſhment. Without this precaution, all he has argued on that head goes for nothing; for as a vaſt diſtance lies between a decent competency, and ſuch poſſeſſions as the Clergy now enjoy, the former may be uſeful, while the latter may prove hurtful. —If Mr. Burrowes had kept in view his patron's poſition, that the preſent eſtabliſhments were *eſſential* to the exiſtence of true religion, he would not find ſuch abſurdity in the uſe which Mr. Barber makes of the text from St. Paul, NOTHING WAS KEPT BACK THAT WAS PROFITABLE.—Mr. Barber very properly points out the bad effects of religious eſtabliſhments. Mr. Burrowes glides over the difficulty, by ſuppoſing the evil alleged to be the abuſes, not the effects of religious eſtabliſhments. But until Mr. Burrowes preſents us with ſomething more than his aſſertion, we muſt conſider intolerance, cruelty, and perſecution as the natural offspring of eſtabliſhments; never have churchmen been obſerved to diſgrace religion by thoſe vices, but when indulged with temporal power, and with temporal poſſeſſions.——Mr. Burrowes ſeems hurt at Mr. O'Leary's ſympathy and compaſſion for his wretched countrymen; and accuſes him of equivocation in his controverſy with Weſley. But Mr. Burrowes miſrepreſents. It is falſe that Mr. O'Leary, or any other Catholic divine, ever ſupported the doctrine: "that promiſes to heretics are void of "obligation in the peculiar caſe of ſafe conducts."

It

It is falſe that the Council of Conſtance ever decreed it. And further, it is falſe that Proteſtants do not enjoy as much, nay more toleration under Catholic governments than Catholics do under Proteſtant governments. The compariſon of Italy and England ſeems deciſive with Mr. Burrowes: but does Mr. Burrowes ſee no difference between refuſing to admit a religion into a country where it never had a footing; and forcing a religion upon people's conſciences by pains and penalties!—Will Mr. Burrowes tell us why he did not mention Germany inſtead of Italy, as Germany lay nearer to him?—The ſucceeding remarks of Mr. Burrowes on the union of church and ſtate; the dangers of Popery, &c. until he arrives at the moon *, in the twenty-ninth page, contain ſo little logic, and ſo much bigotry as would ſwell my criticiſms into a volume, were I to enter into a minute diſcuſſion of his principles and reaſoning.—Mr. Barber, whoſe great crime was a wiſh to pull down all eſtabliſhments, is introduced, page 30, arguing for the eſtabliſhment of Popery; and a curious train of reaſoning is ſet on foot, which would effectually debar men from ever aiming at the general good; becauſe particular inconveniences muſt ariſe.—If we ſuppoſe,

* "A map of Ireland, (ſays Mr. Burrowes) as divided "among the old proprietors (like that of the moon, as "divided among aſtronomers, though not ſo innocent in "its effects, or perhaps in its deſignation) was ſome years "ago publiſhed and purchaſed with great avidity."

I once ſaw a map of the Holy Land, as originally divided among the people of God; and thought, that if the preſent Mahometan rulers of that country were not very ſtupid, they would take ſerious notice of it, though it was drawn by a German Chriſtian for the amuſement of the curious.

poſe, with Mr. Burrowes, the legiſlature to be a ſet of miſſionaries, I allow it to be their bounden duty to propagate the religion of their conſcience: but I tell Mr. Burrowes it ſhould be with the Bible, and not the ſword in their hand: it ſhould be by perſuaſion not by penalties and taxation.—If the Empreſs of Ruſſia ſhould conquer Turkey, demands Mr. Burrowes with an air of triumph, is it her duty to eſtabliſh the religion of Mahomet? No Mr. Burrowes, but it is her duty not to force the Chriſtian religion upon Mahometans: it is her duty not to puniſh Mahometans with penalties for not embracing the Chriſtian religion: it is her duty not to oblige Mahometans to pay the miniſters of the Chriſtian religion.—Mr. Burrowes's pretty phraſe of "there being in Popery "a certain affinity to arbitrary power repulſive "to civil liberty," proves only his ignorance or want of candour. The ſame inference evidently follows from his very illiberal alluſion to the horrid tranſactions of forty-one. Does Mr. Burrowes imagine, that the baſe colours of falſehood, in which profligate hiſtorians have involved that unfortunate period, can impoſe on impartial minds? Has he never heard of hiſtorical monuments which demonſtrate the infamy of the hiſtorians, as well as of the ſtateſmen of that age? Or is falſehood ſo pleaſing as to be retained, and cheriſhed at all events? The united wiſdom of Trinity College has never attempted to refute the narratives to which I refer. Indeed this ſeminary of learning would lately perſuade the legiſlature to order the collection of theſe hiſtorical monuments to be burnt by the hands of the common hangman. This is a kind of argument very deſtructive to paper, but not to the truth contained

ed in paper, which is ever known to ariſe more rectified from hoſtile flames.—Surely the elements of the moral world muſt have received a ſhock, and undergone a change, when we obſerve Colonel Vallancey's philoſophic ſpirit ſweetly aſcending from the artillery, while fire and thunder and ſmoke iſſue forth from the Church and the College.—Mr. Burrowes adopts the principle of preventing the further growth of Popery by the temporal power. How far ſuch a principle may extend, and how conſiſtent with civil liberty, paſt experience abundantly teſtifies. He calls to his aſſiſtance the ſenſe of a Britiſh mob, whoſe groſs prejudices would diſgrace any age or country.—Mr. Burrowes profeſſes himſelf the friend of civil liberty, and yet in accounting for certain laws and eſtabliſhments, he gives us no better reaſon than the will or opinion of, I know not what legiſlator, to whoſe "*car tel eſt notre plaiſir*," the people muſt ſubmit in ſilence, or be treated as rebels by Mr. Burrowes.—The Biſhop of Cloyne, and his worthy aſſiſtants, had pointed to enormities committed by Catholics and by Preſbyterians as proofs of their religious tenets: Mr. Barber very properly retorts, and oppoſes to them the actions of Proteſtants equally exceptionable: Mr. Burrowes exclaims againſt his illiberality in "bringing to view perſecutions long ſince re-"pented of and forgotten," and condemns ſuch a defence as tending to *exaſperate the minds of men.* But as theſe humane reflections, however partial, are not capable, even in the mind of Mr. Burrowes, of doing away the objection, he adopts another method which effectually cuts ſhort all reaſoning: It is to aſcribe to the elder ſiſter all the faults, and the faults alone of the younger ſiſter,

ſiſter, for her perfections it ſeems muſt be all her own. " The perſecutions exerciſed by Proteſtants, (ſays Mr. Burrowes) will be found either the re-
" mains of that ſpirit of intolerance and bigotry,
" from which the church of England for ſome
" time after the reformation, was unable to eman-
" cipate herſelf; or they were occaſional acts of
" princes under the influence of Popiſh counſels,
" and perhaps ſecretly attached to the Popiſh
" communion!"

PROBATUM EST!—Mr. Burrowes concludes by a forced panegyric on Diſſenters, *whoſe habits*, he ſays, *are uſeful to the ſtate*. The habits he means are thoſe of prejudice and hatred againſt Catholics: for " *the Preſbyterians*, he ſays, *look upon Popery as inimical to civil and religious liberty*: and I tell Mr. Burrowes, that *if* he has heard this aſſerted by any Preſbyterians, it muſt be by the moſt ignorant of that enlightened body; for I defy Mr. Burrowes, or any other man in the nation, to diſprove my former aſſertion, namely, that the Catholic religion contains within her pale more republics, nay more democracies, than any other religion upon earth.

Mr. Burrowes would do well to reviſe and correct his late publication, if he means not to bring ſtill greater contempt on the philoſophy of Trinity College, that College, which, in ſpite of the few exceptions adduced by Mr. Burrowes, growing under the ſhade of connivance, muſt be allowed on all hands to have ſhut her gates againſt the great body of the people, and to have tainted the fair garden of ſcience with the fourneſs of bigotry.

A worthy

A worthy repreſentative of this famous Univerſity gave to the world, during the laſt ſeſſion of Parliament, a ſtriking ſpecimen of that philoſophy which preſides over Trinity College. Mr. Brown ſtood up the formidable advocate of the Biſhop of Cloyne's pamphlet; but to the honour of our Houſe of Commons he ſtood alone. His imagination diſdaining the humble courſe of nature ſoared into regions where it could rule without controul. It there depreſſed ſome objects in proportion as it exalted others, and in the exaltation Mr. Brown was not forgotten.—He appeared like an Eaſtern deſpot, and ſeemed to ſit enthroned with the power of millions in his hands, ſeverely arraigning the Catholic body as his mutes for being inattentive to his frowns. His ſuſpicions were demonſtrations with regard to ſlaves, who ſhould leave no room for ſuſpicions; and their attempting to ſpeak againſt what they deem calumny and falſehood was unpardonable inſolence, and baſe ingratitude. Mr. Brown would impoſe ſilence, and recommend grievances as favours, by taking the number of thoſe who wore a certain badge; for the reſt it ſeems had no right to live.—If Mr. Brown has as yet quitted his enchanted chair of ſtate, I would whiſper in his ear the inſolent reflections which were returned by Papiſts to his loſty ſpeech. "How does the "biger ſwell, (ſaid they) with vain thoughts and "empty ſounds! Has he never carried his views "beyond the walls of Trinity College? or can "he think of eſcaping elſewhere the ſneer of ridi-"cule? Are we to become contemptible even to "ourſelves for adhering to principles which we "prefer to his? Or does he imagine that the ſud-"den flutter of a literary coxcomb can prove a

"bugbear

" bugbear to the great Catholic body? Are we
" to ſit ſtill, and acquieſce under calumnies and
" reproaches? Are we not to complain of grie-
" vances, becauſe Mr. Brown threatens to num-
" ber us, and to ſeparate the good from the bad
" by the teſt oath? Before a teſt oath had ex-
" iſtence were we not conſpicuous for a ſtrict
" adherence to principle and an unſhaken loyal-
" ty? We gave greater proofs of both than Mr.
" Brown or Trinity College ever did; and we
" could not be flattered by the compariſon. But
" who is Mr. Brown? Or what gratitude do we
" owe to Mr. Brown and to Trinity College?—
" When we expreſs our contempt of calumnia-
" tors and bigots, is it a concluſion worthy of a
" College to infer, that we are wanting in regard
" to our worthy Proteſtant countrymen? Or what
" affinity is there between a contemptible ſet of
" bigots and ſuch characters as A GRATTAN,
" A FORBES, A JONES, A GRIFFITH, A DOYLE,
" A CURRAN, &c. &c.?"

In cloſing this ſection I would calmly remind Mr. Brown, and his learned conſtituents, of a few ſimple maxims which true philoſophy approves and inculcates, namely, that one man is like another; that we are all endowed with certain feelings; that when theſe feelings are hurt they move us to retribution; and that he who conceiveth groundleſs contempt, ſtoreth up for himſelf a fund of real contempt.

SECTION

SECTION VII.

THE ſeventh ſection, on *the means of remedying the defects in the ſettlement of the Church of Ireland*, promiſes much, produces little, and will, I believe, diſappoint every rational well-wiſher of the eſtabliſhed Church. When it is conſidered, how univerſally non-reſidence prevails, and that thoſe who, by means of great incomes, are beſt able to reſide, appear moſt remarkable for non-reſidence. When we obſerve that ſuch perſons are the moſt inactive in the duties of their profeſſion; that they ſcarce ever ſtoop to ſurvey the lower orders of their flock; much leſs do they follow the guidance of Chriſtian zeal; never do we ſee them attempt to ſupply, by their inſtructions, the want of education in thoſe who are debarred from that bleſſing by their rank in life. When we again reflect, that numbers of the illiterate and poor Proteſtants are daily gained over, not only by Catholics and Preſbyterians, but by Methodiſts, Quakers, and every other diſſenting ſect; and when ſuch evils (for ſuch they muſt appear to a zealous Biſhop) are propoſed to be checked, not by enforcing eccleſiaſtical diſcipline, not by preaching the word, not by exhibiting bright examples of Chriſtian virtues, but by building churches, purchaſing glebes, and aboliſhing the Iriſh language; the remedies muſt appear inadequate and foreign to the diſeaſe; their direct tendency

dency will only be, to make the Proteſtant religion, what Doctor O'Leary very humourouſly terms, *the religion of the ſoil*, but not the religion of the people; and to encreaſe the number of paſtors, in proportion as their flocks and their duties diminiſh.

My Lord, you had before adverted to the zeal of Catholics in making proſelytes. When this zeal proceeds according to the rules of reaſon and of religion, it muſt gain the applauſe of every impartial man; and the means by which it operates are ſo beneficial to ſociety at large, that all lovers of mankind will ever feel and regret its abſence among any deſcription of Chriſtians.—Whether the pampered dignitaries of the eſtabliſhed Church are actuated by ſuch a zeal; whether they ſtoop to the labour which it points out; or whether, from their averſion to ſo irkſome a taſk, they are conſtantly calling on the civil power to interfere with temporal arms, where ſpiritual arms only ſhould be uſed? Whether this alſo be the fruitful ſource of the many *dreams, alarms, conſiderations, antidotes*, &c. &c. which are piouſly reared from a miſrepreſentation of known truths; are queſtions within the reach of every claſs of men in ſociety, towards the ſolution of which no profound reſearches are requiſite. We have only to open our eyes, look round, and ſee!

Indeed, if the defects mentioned by your Lordſhip, in a former ſection, were the bars to the propagation of religion, and to the converſion of unbelievers, the remedies which you propoſe would be adequate and conſiſtent. But I have already ſhewn the futility of ſuch a ſuppoſition; and

and in whatever light, whether political or religious, the buſineſs of converſion is viewed, it muſt always ſeem prepoſterous to appoint a paſtor, build a church, and purchaſe a glebe, before a flock is provided. It is a new mode of converting ſinners, unheard of in the world, and unexampled in the annals of Chriſtianity. For I cannot think your Lordſhip would, in order to avoid a contradiction, imitate the example of the pious Elizabeth, and drive the people to the new worſhip by fines and forfeitures. If nothing elſe could prevent the adoption of ſuch meaſures, ſurely the long experience of their inefficacy ſhould for ever diſcredit any further trial of them.

We may, therefore, conſign your ſeventh ſection to the ſame fate which your fourth ſection, *on the defects in the ſettlement of the Church of Ireland*, has already undergone.

In that ſection I ſpoke of the eſtabliſhed Clergy, and my language, I fear, will appear inſupportable to Doctor Stock, who gives the epithet of *Cruſty* to the words *Calomnier et nairvir*, quoted from MONTESQUIEU by Doctor Campbell.——I ſhould be ſorry to offend Doctor Stock. Of all the Biſhop of Cloyne's auxiliaries, he alone exhibits in his ſentiments, and in his language, a Chriſtian benevolence worthy of his profeſſion.* His conduct in private life, as I am informed, diſcovers the ſame amiable diſpoſition; and if the preſent conteſt had begun with him, it would, I believe, have been carried on without aſperity on

* See, however, the anecdote at the end of this work, which has come to my knowledge whilſt the laſt ſheet was at the preſs.

either ſide. But Doctor STOCK falling into the diſpute at ſuch a period, and in ſuch a capacity as he did, thought it incumbent on him to look to his right-hand man, and to commit himſelf with his brethren. This I take to be the true ſource of thoſe defects in his pamphlet which I ſhall point out.

The rule which Doctor Stock preſcribes to his antagoniſt, ſeems to have been totally diſregarded by himſelf. He tells Doctor Campbell, "that we "are to examine with attention facts which we "think material to our purpoſe, and to enquire "whether their evidence may not be weakened or "overthrown by contrary teſtimony."—Has Doctor Stock regulated his conduct by this rule? He enters the liſts in defence of the Biſhop of Cloyne; he denies that "the Right Reverend writer had "the ſmalleſt intention to bring an accuſation of "this high nature," namely, "of being diſaffected to our admired conſtitution, and of ſecretly "wiſhing to ſubvert it againſt ſo great a proportion of his fellow ſubjects." As proofs of his aſſertion, he quotes the *very words* of the Right Reverend Author. But did he examine "whether their evidence might not be overthrown by "contrary teſtimony?"—The ſame Right Reverend Author ſets forth, as leading principles of his pamphlet, "that Catholics are by their tenets "impelled to erect their eccleſiaſtical eſtabliſhment on the ruin of others; that Preſbyterians "are by their tenets levellers, and aim at pulling "down all eſtabliſhments: that the outrages in "the ſouth were the effects of a deep laid ſcheme, "a general conſpiracy of Papiſts to ſubvert the "eſtabliſhed church; for, ſays the Biſhop, that "this, namely, to ſubvert the eſtabliſhed church,

"is

" is the immediate tendency, if not the preme-
" ditated deſign, not only of the riotous proceed-
" ings in Munſter, but of the principles diſſemi-
" nated by ſome of the public prints, ſhall be
" clearly proved in the following pages."—More-
over, will Doctor Stock explain to us, what do the words " hope of foreign aſſiſtance import?" or what is meant by ſaying, that " Catholics, as " men, are often better than their tenets?"—Who-
ever peruſes the Biſhop of Cloyne's pamphlet, and conſiders the *pious* uſe to which he turns the letter of a Pope's Nuncio, and the conſecration oath of Catholic Biſhops, muſt allow, that the principles which I here adduce are the corner ſtones of the ſtructure raiſed by the dignified architect; and that the extracts upon which Doctor Stock dwells, are only detached pieces not adjuſted to, nor incorporated with the main work, but evidently calculated for evaſions and ſubterfuges.—Doctor Stock then appears to me to have ſounded a retreat for the Biſhop, and to have *prudently* avoided any diſquiſition upon tenets, tithes *jus divinum*, the impoſſibility of commutation, reduction, the fatal effects of either, &c. &c. he ſaw no ſtrength in the puny ſophiſms urged on theſe heads. But he attempts to cover the Biſhop's retreat, and in the attempt does not eſcape unhurt. He applauds the Biſhop's zeal in ſtanding forth the champion of the Church. The Church, he apprehends has been in extreme peril; for he adopts the Biſhop's repreſentation of things in the moſt unreſerved manner. Doctor Stock forgets again his own rule; he " examines not with attention " facts which he thinks material to his purpoſe; " nor does he enquire whether their evidence " may not be weakened or overthrown by con-
" trary teſtimony." *Facts*, ſays again Doctor

Stock, "partially quoted or ſuppreſſed muſt be "brought into full day."—* It is a fact then, that the Catholic Clergy ſuffered more in the late outrages than the Proteſtant Clergy. It is a fact, that there were Proteſtants among the inſurgents. It is a fact, that the inſurgents were headed by Proteſtants. It is a fact, that wherever the inſurgents were encouraged, or connived at, by men of any note or conſideration, ſuch men were Proteſtants.—Theſe facts eſſentially alter the ſtate of the caſe; and theſe facts are totally ſuppreſſed by the Biſhop of Cloyne, and after him by Doctor Stock.—Doctor Stock indeed offers a tribute of praiſe to my Lord Kenmare, but he ſeems to doubt "whether ſuch a character be not an uncommon "one in this nation;" and did he not hear, that the ſufferings of the Catholic Clergy were occaſioned by their zeal and exertions? The Biſhop of Cloyne and Doctor Stock could not have been ignorant of theſe circumſtances. They have ſuppreſſed them!—Are theſe things leſs ſhocking to a *gentle* reader than the *cruſty expreſſions, calomnier et naircir?* And if theſe things be founded in truth, do they not leave room for the proper application of the expreſſions? The words are not obſolete, the beſt writers uſe them, and if there be a fitneſs between them and the objects which they are meant to denote, I do not ſee what exception can be taken againſt them. For my part, I always wiſh to adapt my expreſſions to the ideas which I conceive.—I am ſorry Doctor Stock has expoſed himſelf in this inſtance, to a charge of an ugly complexion, by an intemperate zeal for ſome of his brethren. In the inſtance alluded to above, his apology would transform, or rather,

* See Doctor O'Leary's Defence.

to

to uſe his own witty, if not *cruſty* expreſſion, would *tranſubſtantiate* the Biſhop of Cloyne's publication.—The reſt of Doctor Stock's pamphlet, containing hiſtorical diſquiſitions, and deductions from them, is in general well directed, and oppoſes Doctor Campbell with effect.

That gentleman, whoſe abilities I am ready to acknowledge, has either through precipitancy or prejudice, left himſelf open to ſome ſerious objections. As he ſeems, were he and his party in ſafety, not to be very ſolicitous about the fate of the reſt of mankind. So neither does reaſon nor hiſtory ſeem to ſupport him on that partial and confined ground.—I entirely agree with Doctor Campbell in aſcribing bad effects to great temporal eſtabliſhments and power conferred on the Clergy. But whether Doctor Campbell has been happy in his choice of examples I doubt very much. The fathers whom he produces from early ages, were, according to no weak authority, endowed with as ſublime virtues as their abilities were confeſſedly great. Doctor Campbell ſeems to me to have taken Arian hiſtorians *alone* for his vouchers, and if he has decided on ſuch evidence, he has tranſgreſſed the rules of criticiſm.

Again, I take it for granted, as an inconteſtible point of hiſtory, that no Chriſtian ſect exiſts of two hundred years ſtanding, which has not had its days of bigotry; when many of its members perverted its tenets, either in principles or concluſions; and that were we to arraign the repreſentatives of all theſe different denominations of Chriſtians, before us, he who would caſt the firſt ſtone, might be the laſt whom reaſon would acquit.

acquit.—I hold it equally inconteſtible, that theſe inauſpicious days have paſſed away never more to return. The progreſs of knowledge, and the experience of mankind, have traced a permanent line of diſtinction between things ſpiritual and temporal; and there is no Chriſtian ſect at preſent whoſe doctrines, and diſcipline, and morality, are not applicable to any form of government. The only bigotry that now ſubſiſts, and will probably long ſubſiſt, becauſe ſupported by fear, which flies from diſcuſſion, takes its riſe in the miſrepreſentations and falſifications of wicked, deſigning, and ſelf-intereſted men. Such men practice on the credulity and ignorance of mankind. They repreſent, to a favoured ſect, all thoſe of a different creed as hoſtile in political concerns; and thus recommend reſtraints and legal incapacities as ſalutary and neceſſary.

If Doctor Campbell had ſucceeded in his attempt to prove an exemption in favour of his party from the former of theſe inconteſtible points; ſuch a mode of obtaining the ſuffrage of the latter would ſeem unfavourable to other ſects.—But Doctor Stock has effectually fruſtrated his attempt. And although Doctor Campbell lays the blood of the firſt CHARLES at the door of the independents, yet, in my opinion, the independents are as loyal ſubjects, and as proper members of civil ſociety, as any other denomination of Chriſtians.

Doctor Campbell not only reaſons wrong, by confining himſelf too much to a party, but he alſo diſcovers ſome ſymptoms of intolerance!—Indeed, I cannot ſay that this odious, and in

Doctor

Doctor Campbell inconſiſtent ſpirit, is ſuffered to appear in explicit terms through the courſe of his pamphlet; but in treading that ground I thought I felt it! I have ſince ſeen, or thought I ſaw it, attend on Doctor Campbell, and on ſome of his reverend brethren; and their High Mightineſſes, the Monthly Reviewers, have, in their account of Doctor Campbell's pamphlet, almoſt diſpelled my doubts on that head, by very liberally ſtyling the Catholics of Ireland *The common enemy!*—It would ſeem that the ideas of popery, and ſlavery, and bigotry, and cruelty, were ſtill aſſociated in the mind of Doctor Campbell; and that Doctor Campbell did not wiſh to unfold his mind in expreſs terms.—I call on Doctor Campbell to ſpeak out.—I defy him to aſſign a ſingle tenet of the Catholic religion that is not perfectly conſiſtent with the genuine principles of civil liberty, and of Chriſtian toleration.—The Monthly Reviewers, thoſe adepts in philoſophy, I could addreſs with all the good nature of a blundering Iriſhman, as *my dearly beloved brethren*, were I not apprehenſive, that they would, for *ſeveral* reaſons, deny the kindred; wherefore, until I am acknowledged as a true brother, I ſhall prefer my addreſs as a ſubject; but then it will be to expoſtulate and to remonſtrate.

HIGH AND MIGHTY SIRS,

SINCE you have taken upon yourſelves the government of the intellectual world, I often looked up to you with reverence and awe. Your directions I generally waited, in order to aſcend the hill of the Muſes, or to enter into the temple

of

of Science, for you appeared to me the ſureſt guides. I ſoon found, to my great ſatisfaction, that, like other potentates, you began to extend your dominions.—The cauſe of virtue you warmly eſpouſed; you felt for the proſperity and happineſs of mankind. The tyrant you withſtood, the oppreſſed you cheered, and to extend the empire of civil and religious liberty, was profeſſedly held out as one great object of your auſpicious reign. In ſuch principles ſo congenial to my nature, I heartily coincided with you. I followed your banners through many different regions. I followed you to the plains of Indoſtan, where human nature often ſighed unheard; and from thence to the Weſtern Iſles, where the groans of the afflicted African were daily loſt in the ſurrounding billows. You ſeemed to me to conſider all mankind as one family, the members of which, however different in features, in dreſs, in age, or in abilities, were born to the enjoyment of the ſame benefits and of the ſame protection. Your maxims, I thought, would reſtore to the ſons of men that dignity, to which they are by nature intitled; and I did not imagine, that after traveling ſo far, you would forget your *door neighbours*.

Indeed, I had long obſerved, that whenever *Popery* came in your way, it operated like a magical ſpell; it ſeemed to chain down your diſcurſive powers, and to freeze your ſympathetic feelings.—That inquiſitive reaſon which unravels the myſterious claims of tyranny, and proves them equally inſufficient, whether ſupported by the diſtance of place, by the length of time, or by the ſanctity of religion, deſerted you on theſe occaſions; and the eighty-fifth ſociety of GLASGOW might

might vie with your auguſt and learned body in philoſophizing upon *Popery*.

The world was often ſtruck by the force of your arguments againſt any infringments on the rights of mankind. All impartial and benevolent men joined their voice to yours in reprobating tyranny. They heard you out on the heart-rending woes of perſecuted and oppreſſed Proteſtants.—When Papiſts came on afterwards, it was matter of aſtoniſhment to ſee *you* erect that tyranny which you had been pulling down, and offer to the world no other reaſons for injuſtice, cruelty, and oppreſſive reſtraints, than the vague words *neceſſity*, *expediency*; or ſome very unſatisfactory ſneers on the patches, paint, and I know not what of *Mother Church!*

Is it then Popery, or is it her native ſoil, that has raiſed a cloud between our iſland and your penetrating eyes?—The moſt numerous claſs of our people lie in the ſhade of oppreſſion, and groan under extreme miſery. Such an evil has never attracted your notice.—The unfortunate diſturbances of the ſouth, have from time to time prevailed for more than twenty years paſt. Severity has been often uſed. Human victims have been offered. Severity would have checked the evil, if it had its ſource in licentiouſneſs.—You, Sirs, had ſufficient time to ſee to the bottom of it.

And could you ſee no falſehoods in the ſpurious Theophilus? Could the Biſhop of Cloyne's fanciful ſyſtem of a natural conformity between different religions and different forms of government, appear to you *a very ſenſible and very candid*

did enquiry? And could you, in the next month, join Doctor Campbell in repreſenting the ſame ſyſtem as an idle and groundleſs ſpeculation?—Could you, like the worſt of tyrants, hold up one part of the ſame community as the common enemy of the other, and thus aim at kindling the flames of civil diſcord?

And where, Sirs, is that accuracy which generally diſtinguiſhes your obſervations on other ſubjects?—General expreſſions either have no meaning, or may have any meaning. And what in the name of wonder is meant by that *full toleration* to which Catholics and Diſſenters are entitled in the Biſhop of Cloyne's principles? Is it to breathe, and pray, and faſt, and bear the produce of mother earth to mother church?—Beware, Sirs, leſt while your are regulating the heads of others you neglect your own; and become the abettors of that intellectual confuſion and diſcordancy, by which the regular connexion of objects, and ideas, and words is loſt, and the *byſtanders* are moved to pity or contempt. The Catholics loudly proclaim, that in proportion as your high ſounding words, "*civil and religious liberty*," fill and expand their ears, they feel the reſt of their frame cramped and reſtrained.—What then is liberty? Or what, high and mighty Sirs, is the object of your zeal and purſuits?—Is it the monſter Tyranny under a falſe appearance?—And is liberty with you, high and mighty Sirs, worſe than a name?

SECTION

SECTION VIII.

MY LORD, your eighth and laſt ſection, *On the injury ſuſtained by the parochial clergy in their property; and the means of reinſtating them in their former rights*; miſtates and exaggerates ſome facts while it ſuppreſſes others, and leaves us to the reaſoning which may be expected from ſuch unfair premiſes.—When firſt I ſaw your Lordſhip's repreſentation of things, though far diſtant from the ſcenes of the late diſturbances, I conceived it erroneous. I thought it deſtroyed itſelf; for there appeared in it an incoherence, and an inconſiſtency very incompatible with truth. We there ſaw a Popiſh banditti acting upon religious principles. A deep laid ſcheme for the ſubverſion of church and ſtate. The avowed agents, poor illiterate ignorant Papiſts. The encouragers and planners ſpecified, though glanced at only, Proteſtants of note and conſideration. So that either, the only perſons capable of forming ſchemes, muſt have knowingly concerted their own ruin; or thoſe who are ſuppoſed unequal to any thing ſyſtematic, muſt have had the ſingular addreſs of planning deep laid ſchemes; and of drawing into their ſnares the informed, and the thinking.—Such contradictory poſitions carried with them their own refutation; and I then thought that the indignation excited in your Lordſhip's breaſt, by the outrages of the inſurgents, had betrayed you unawares into thoſe haſty declamations, thoſe violent

lent exceſſes of intellectual operations, which are conſidered as the unintentional violations of truth and juſtice.—Since the Rev. Doctor O'Leary publiſhed his defence I have had ample cauſe for receding from my former opinion. That benevolent character and friend of mankind, whoſe information enlightens; whoſe humour laughs even fanatics into ſenſe; and whoſe veracity cannot be impeached even by the malice of bigots; has had the faireſt opportunity of obſerving the riſe, progreſs, nature, and extent of the late outrages; he has candidly unfolded the different operations in the South; and his narrative ſo eſſentially differs from that of your Lordſhip, and of your Lordſhip's auxiliaries, that the notion of involuntary errors on your part becomes quite inadmiſſible. The ſhameful ſuppreſſion of facts and circumſtances unfriendly to your purpoſe, the exaggerated and extravagant deſcription of whatever ſeemed in the moſt diſtant manner to favour it, have ſtampt ſuch a character on your narratives as inſtantly revolts all candid and impartial friends.—A deep laid ſcheme of calumny and defamation is eaſily diſcoverable; for this pious purpoſe it was thought expedient, that two ſingular figures ſhould attend your Lordſhip into public view; a precurſor and a follower: and the holy clergy, to convince the world of their diſintereſtedneſs, reſolved that theſe doughty ſquires ſhould be laymen.

The former ſuperlatively dull might excite our admiration at the choice of the clergy, if a mind faſhioned by nature to vulgar ribaldry, and ſordid falſifications, had not amply ſupplied the defect. This wretch is extolled by your Lordſhip

as

as an able writer! a man of abilities! and the crime of conſcious ſlander, of *bearing falſe witneſs againſt the neighbour*, is charitably imputed by your Lordſhip to a zeal for religion, in a miſcreant, who would as readily ſubſcribe to the Koran as to the thirty-nine articles, if the Koran held out to him the ſame temporal advantages.

The latter truſty ſquire is the renowned Dominick Trant:—Family and property, and education, and travelling, ſometimes expand the mind, and improve the heart; but at other times they leave both as they found them:—Dominick Trant lived on the ſpot, he could boaſt of family and conſequence. If the precepts of a liberal education, and the rectifying flame which iſſues from an intercourſe with mankind, had not ſunk into his mind, they had at leaſt acted on the ſurface; and Dominick Trant could make fine profeſſions, conſtruct pretty phraſes, and quote the noble ſayings of great claſſical authors. From the ribaldry of Theophilus to the little tinſel of Dominick Trant, a great difference in ſtyle and manner prevailed: various taſtes might be pleaſed, and yet the leading opinion and leading calumnies were the ſame.—Dominick Trant ſtiled your Lordſhip's man of abilities, *a well meaning writer*, and varniſhed your Lordſhip's pamphlet with his praiſe. Dominick Trant had deſerved well of the church, and until the more ſubſtantial rewards could reach his merit, his vanity was to be fed with incenſe. The *learned* Deans and Chapters, who had offered incenſe to your Lordſhip, addreſſed Dominick Trant; Dominick Trant returned the incenſe, and between them our immortal Swift was ſadly befouled.—To hear Dominick Trant's profeſſions,

one

one would imagine, that the elegance, politeneſs, honour, and philanthropy of thoſe famous countries, through which he travelled, were all his own. No bias, he ſays, can affect him, and yet in his next page we ſee the words *Papiſt, Popiſh, Popery,* in prominent characters. To what muſt we attribute this inconſiſtency and indecorum?—We cannot ſuppoſe Dominick Trant to be ignorant of the moſt obvious rules of politeneſs; he knows it to be a flagrant breach of theſe rules to deſign any man or body of men by terms which to them ſeem reproachful. But Dominick Trant has learned to ſpeak and to think as *occaſion* requires. He agrees with your Lordſhip in referring the diſturbances of the South to a Popiſh conſpiracy, and points out the great body of the people, the Catholics and Preſbyterians of Ireland, as *internal confederated enemies:* and yet in his idle ſpeculations on the ſtate of Ireland he declares, that the *miſery* of the Munſter peaſantry is extreme.—And is extreme miſery ſuch a trifle as to be productive of no ſtriking effects?—For my part I conſider it ſo active a cauſe as to be always fruitful in tremendous conſequences. Would the Biſhop of Cloyne or Dominick Trant be patient, reſigned, or even *peaceable* under *extreme miſery?*—But it ſeems the baſe nature of Iriſhmen is not to be compared with that of others; for a Britiſh prelate tells the world, that to acknowledge to the moſt wretched of mankind, that they are wretched, is goading them to madneſs, as if their feelings were as callous as Britons are wont to conceive their intellects.—Dominick Trant ſeems as little concerned about the extreme miſery of Iriſhmen as the Britiſh prelate. It is true he ſpeaks of it, and aſſigns to it certain cauſes and remedies which are

either

either not radical, or not attainable. If the fault lies with the gentlemen of landed property, ſurely Dominick Trant muſt be an exception: and is there no extreme miſery to be found on his eſtate? But an aſpiring genius in this country muſt not diſguſt Britiſh monopoliſts: let him rather flatter their prejudices. Dominick Trant aſſerts, that ferocity is natural to the *native Iriſh*. The words native Iriſh are analogous to the liberal expreſſion of *mere Iriſh; wild Iriſh; Hibernis ipſis Hiberniores*. So common in Britiſh writings, and ſo grateful to Britiſh ears. To theſe expreſſions, the idea of ferocity and of every other brutal paſſion, has been annexed. Yet in all impartial hiſtorians, generoſity, hoſpitality, and compaſſionate feelings, form a part of our character.—Indeed this mode of vilifying the national character is not peculiar to Dominick Trant. Perhaps it leads to honour; for we have been told not long ſince by a *right honourable*, that we are a *beſotted nation, a people eaſily rouſed and eaſily appeaſed*.—Shame upon the wretch who reviles his native land, and calumniates that country to which he owes his ALL!

Dominick Trant feels no ſhame or concern but for the outrages in the South. Such evils alone, are, according to Dominick Trant, capable of tarniſhing our name and reputation; yet before I join in his lamentation, I ſhall beg leave to remark, that wherever mobs, or riots, or tumults, have taken place, (and where have they not been obſerved?) a certain ſhare of ferocity and cruelty has conſtantly been their natural attendant; and that in no other country has leſs of either appeared on ſuch diſaſtrous occaſions, than in Ireland. To impreſs then ſuch a ſtigma on our national character

character is illiberal and unjuſt.—But that thoſe whom family, or fortune, or rank, or ſtation, has raiſed above the crowd; thoſe in whom the heroic ſentiments which dignify men have every opportunity of being foſtered and unfolded: thoſe to whom the bulk of mankind are taught to look up for examples of rectitude, of integrity and of true honour. That ſuch men ſhould deal in baſe falſications: circulate wilful falſehoods: aſſume the garb of virtue and patriotiſm, for the purpoſe of concealing their moſt ſordid, moſt miſerable private views and intereſts, and ſacrifice their country on the altar of corruption! *pudet hæc opprobria nobis et dici potuiſſe et non potuiſſe refelli.*

My Lord, after the many ſtrained lamentations ſung over the diſtreſſes of the eſtabliſhed clergy, I may be allowed to turn aſide, and ſpeak of objects which have been totally overlooked.—Your Lordſhip ſets forth, that the "eſtabliſhed clergy "are the only aggrieved ſet of men in the com-"munity."—It is a fact that the Catholic clergy have ſuffered more in the late outrages; but another claſs of men (if we can ſuppoſe them men) of whom Dominick Trant has acknowledged, that extreme miſery is the portion, is more numerous than both orders of clergy: and why not entitled to notice? My Lord, *extreme miſery* is a ſtrong expreſſion, and not exaggerated in the preſent inſtances; it is not even ſo univerſally applied as it ought: for not only the Munſter peaſantry, but the lower orders of the people in almoſt all parts of the kingdom, are in that horrid predicament.—Whether we go to the vaſt plains of Aſia, where deſpotic ſway has unnerved mankind; whether we turn to the ſcorching regions of Africa, where

cruelty

cruelty ſupplies the want of knowledge in the governors, and the want of pliancy in the governed: or whether we ſurvey the wilds of America, where the roving tribes of ſavages ſeem as uncultivated as the ſpontaneous produce of the country which they overrun: in no part of the globe is there to be found ſuch miſery as in Ireland! And Ireland is perhaps of all other countries the beſt adapted by nature to human felicity. And the people of Ireland are the neighbours and fellow-ſubjects of the wealthieſt, happieſt, and moſt pampered people upon earth:—A ſhocking evil under the ſun, my Lord, but not more ſhocking than that there are to be found in the ſame country, men ſo hardened and ſo blindfolded by bigotry, as not to be affected by the greateſt of human woes, and not to ſee that ſuch evils muſt have their effects as well as their cauſes.—To ſpeak of theſe evils has I know been termed ſeditious. But humanity ſpurns the tyrannical maxim; and had I a voice of thunder, I would ſend forth to the extremities of the earth the cries and groans of my afflicted countrymen, and leave bigots to reaſon as bigotry directs.—To ſuch men, whatever coincides not with their fanciful little ſyſtems, will appear unreaſonable. And though human nature were to bleed through millions of individuals, ſuch bigots would ſtill ſee nothing but the ſufferings of a few clergymen.—I have already ſaid that I thought myſelf diſpenſed from entering into a detail of theſe ſufferings. I ſhall only in general terms declare, that I am as averſe to riots or tumults as your Lordſhip can be, and that from my heart I abhor the exerciſe of cruelty on any of the human ſpecies, and moſt eſpecially on the helpleſs and informed.—At the ſame time I am

free to avow, that the eſtabliſhed clergy have not during the late outrages appeared to me like *lambs among wolves*. They have diſcovered a ſtrong tendency to military executions, and to that mode of diſpatching ſinners which martial law preſcribes. Their reſentment did not ſeem under the controul of goſpel rules; and wherever the civil power centered in their hands, we have witneſſed ſcenes of bloodſhed which it was the glory of military commanders to remove. Their publications breathed all along a ſpirit of tyranny and cruelty not congenial with the religion which they profeſs, or with the conſtitution under which they live; and their falſifying arts have brought no credit on the order.—Doubtleſs many of that ſacred order are entitled to a different character; men who deſerve well of ſociety, and have therefore a claim to the reſpect and veneration of every denomination of Chriſtians.—One in particular, who ſtyled himſelf, *what he really is, a beneficed clergyman,* has been conſpicuouſly forward in the late conteſts, and has given ſuch marks of benevolence, of philanthropy, of candour, and of honour, as would grace any country or profeſſion.

If my cenſures on the miniſters of the eſtabliſhed religion be conſtrued into diſloyalty, I muſt obſerve, that unleſs theſe Rev. Gentlemen arrogate to themſelves the attributes of impeccability, their accuſation muſt prove ineffectual. For if the public conduct of miniſters of ſtate, who poſſeſs the confidence of our ſovereign, be open to the freeſt diſcuſſion, and to the freeſt cenſure, Why ſhould any other order of men claim an exemption from public animadverſion? But this

objection

objection I ſhould have totally diſregarded, as proceeding from bigotted churchmen, who have ever been noted for a peculiar tendency to every ſpecies of tyranny, if a certain patriotic county member had not declared in full ſenate, " that the " bench of biſhops had been reviled, and that " the glorious revolution of 1688 might as well " be reviled."

I have every reſpect for that gentleman's upright intentions. No man, I think, poſſeſſes a more independent, a more undaunted ſpirit, or a greater incorruptibility of heart. But a ſtrange weakneſs of intellects has alſo characteriſed him. He received early in life the unjuſt and abſurd ideas annexed to the words, *popery*, *ſlavery*, *Proteſtant intereſt*, *glorious revolution*. Theſe diſcordant principles have often fermented in his active and feeble mind; and their droſs, it ſeems, is not as yet thrown off.—I tell that gentleman that I revere the principles of civil and religious liberty as much as he does; and have as little reſpect for the memory of the unfortunate race of Stuarts.—In as much as the revolution of 1688 favoured the cauſe of freedom, it has my moſt hearty applauſe; but I have not for it, or for any thing elſe, that ever came from the hands of men, a blind and ſuperſtitious veneration.—I aſſert with confidence, and I defy the honourable gentleman to diſprove my aſſertion, that ſomething accompanied or followed that famous event which proved deſtructive to Ireland.—It was in the ſhadow of the great temple, then raiſed to freedom, on which men gazed with enthuſiaſtic zeal, that our conſtitution and commerce fell, and lay entombed together, until a late revolution did in part revive them.—

May the honourable gentleman learn from paſt experience to ward againſt future ills; and may he never more remind the public of his former *intolerance*.

It is time that I cloſe my remarks, and quit the diſagreeable office of pointing to malice and folly. —For the facts which incontrovertibly prove what I have more than once advanced, namely, that conſcious ſlander and wilful falſehood have been uſed to impoſe on the world, I refer to the publications of the moſt Rev. Doctor Butler, and of the Rev. Mr. O'Leary.—The half-learned bigots, who have ſince appeared in numbers with mighty promiſes of anſwers and refutations, have only cavilled at words, or nibbled at petty circumſtances of no avail. Indeed they have let looſe a torrent of invectives on thoſe who dare oppoſe what they cannot defend; and the very noble deſcent of the venerable Doctor Butler has not ſcreened him from the contemptuous ſcurrility of low bigots.—The cenſure of ſuch men would be to me a flattering teſtimony of ſuperior merit; for, did I feel myſelf loaded with their heavy praiſe, I ſhould inſtantly ſuſpect ſomething wrong in my head, or in my heart.—If I am to be honoured by their anſwers and refutations; let them not go aſide into the unmeaning obſcurity of ambiguous and general expreſſions. The field lies open to them; and if cavilling be at all allowable, reaſon demands, that the neceſſary duty of ſpeaking to the main points, to the great poſitions, ſhould go before.

My Lord, I truſt, I have ſufficiently expoſed the fallacy of your Lordſhip's reaſoning. I have proved

proved your principles, when well directed, to be falſe; when true, to be wide of the queſtion: your concluſions ſo looſe as would lead to any abſurdity; and the whole, by the ſeaſoning of a ſtudied ambiguity of expreſſion, adapted only to the taſtes of the weak and the bigoted.—Were I inclined to go farther, and to adopt your Lordſhip's mode of reaſoning for different purpoſes, I could, with a greater ſhow of probability than reſults from your Lordſhip's pamphlet, excite the alarms of the Catholics and Diſſenters, of more than nine tenths of the people of Ireland. I could, from *your Lordſhip's principles*, point out to them the ungovernable tendency of their countrymen of the eſtabliſhed church to tyranny and oppreſſion. "The concluſion would be manifeſt that ſuch men "are not entitled to their confidence:" and then we ſhould have worſhipful ſociety! But ſuch practices I diſdain, not becauſe I fear the Biſhop of Cloyne, or his *able writers*, or Dominick Trant, or any man of a ſimilar ſtamp in whatever rank or ſtation; but becauſe I am conſcious that in doing ſo, I ſhould violate truth as well as juſtice, and confound ſome of the moſt patriotic, moſt liberal, and moſt honourable men of the nation, with the moſt contemptible in it.

My Lord, the many and various deductions which follow from your Lordſhip's grand poſitions, would degrade the great body of the people of Ireland to as abject a ſtate of ſlavery as the Aſiatic regions have ever witneſſed. Not only the reaſoning, but the very ſtyle of the late publications points to that end. The Catholics and Preſbyterians of Ireland appear in no other light than as hewers of wood and drawers of water. No

rights

RIGHTS are acknowledged in them; their very exiſtence ſeems ignored; for the language of privileged ſouls excludes all idea of them, not only from the words, *ſtate*, *government*, *legiſlature*, *conſtitution*, &c. but alſo from the humble appellations of public, people, ſoldiers, ſailors, &c. &c. Can ſuch be the effects of Chriſtian zeal?—Or may we exclaim, *Wo!*——" for you have tithed mint, " and aniſe, and cummin, and have let alone the " the weightier things of the law: judgment, " and mercy, and faith?"

CONCLU-

CONCLUSION.

WHEN the voice of reaſon loudly proclaims to Iriſhmen, " Beware of inteſtine diviſions, be- " ware of thoſe who ſow the ſeeds of civil diſcord " among you, in order to deprive you of the " fruits of your induſtry :" the ſalutary admonition is addreſſed to the Proteſtant, as well as to the Catholic and Diſſenter.—If ſome Proteſtants are taken into the partnerſhip of iniquity, the number will appear inconſiderable with regard to the Proteſtant body; and whatever advantage may accrue, will be amply counterbalanced by the vain hopes and vain conceits, which muſt miſlead many Proteſtants, and ſubject them to greater miſery than either Diſſenters or Catholics experience.

The baneful policy, which had ſo long waſted this unhappy country, had its roots fixed in Britain, and its branches ſpread amongſt us through many claſſes and ranks of corrupt and ſelf-intereſted men. It was lately thought, that various cauſes had blaſted this devouring evil, and that the light of truth, and the kind influence of virtue and freedom would ſupply its place, and operate to the happineſs and contentment of ALL.—To me it ſeems no longer doubtful, that the preſent miniſtry have imparted peculiar energy to this deſtructive

ſtructive ſyſtem of policy, and have revived its latent powers in root and branch.

The Macheavelian ſcheme, *divide and govern*, though often adopted by men of abilities, is rather a wretched temporary expedient, than a plan calculated for any permanent purpoſe; but whatever effects it may ſometimes produce, the abettors of it always thought it neceſſary to have its tendency concealed, until our preſent glorious miniſtry diſabuſed the world, by openly and avowedly ſcattering the ſeeds of diſcord through the land.—On their firſt entering into power, they ſaw with ſecret envy and regret, that Iriſhmen had, by ſome ſhew of unanimity, ſucceſsfully ſhook off Britiſh ſhackles, and were then aſſiduouſly employed in guarding againſt the undermining operation of corrupt influence, which as effectually and more ſecurely leads to ruin. They knew the means, which their virtuous predeceſſors had uniformly made uſe of, in order to divide, to oppreſs, and to plunder this unhappy nation; it was to profeſs themſelves miſſionaries, and to be unlimited in what they required for their ſpiritual favours, though it were to ſtrip the faithful of every thing. But the moral conduct of our new miſſionaries ſeemed at ſtrange variance with the hallowed accents which fell from their lips; and while our ears were attuned to the ſacred ſounds of *religion*, *goſpel*, *purity*, and *truth*, we beheld a *funny club* exchange the morality of CHRIST for that of Mahomet! However, this unfavourable circumſtance was not ſufficient to defeat their *pious* deſigns.—There remained in this country a certain fund of bigotry, on which the moſt aukward tools might operate with ſucceſs. Not only the

the ſuſpicious character of the teachers, but even the notorious falſhood of the doctrine did not diſcredit the proceedings. Bigotry, though ſtrange it may appear, will ſometimes give credit in proportion to the abſurdity of the object.—The chief promoters of parliamentary reform, and of all other patriotic meaſures, which have been lately propoſed and rejected, were Proteſtants of the eſtabliſhed religion, and in general the greateſt ornaments of that church. This incontrovertible fact, which one would imagine ſhould have ſome weight, was eaſily overlooked; and the *pious* abſurdities circulated by a Britiſh junto, for the purpoſes of enſlaving all deſcriptions of Iriſhmen, were *piouſly* believed by many.—The *Papiſts* and *Puritans* had formed a conſpiracy againſt church and ſtate! Nothing but the connexion with the ſiſter kingdom could withſtand their power! And whatever was propoſed in favour of our unprotected manufactures, or againſt profuſion and peculation, *manifeſtly tended* to weaken that connexion! Nay, to complain of grievances, was repreſented as open rebellion; and the people of Ireland were to learn the horrid doctrine, "that "the good of their country was incompatible with "the allegiance due to their Sovereign!"

Such are the grand principles of Mr. Orde's ſyſtem of politics; under the cover of which the liberties and properties of the good people of Ireland are daily invaded, with ſuch marks of contempt, with ſuch inſults, and with ſuch indignities, that the deſpotic intention of governing by fear can be eaſily perceived. But whether this mode of governing be adapted to the Iriſh character; whether it be for the intereſt of Britain,

are

are queſtions, the ſolution of which can reflect no honour on the preſent adminiſtration. To their private views, even the intereſt of Britain would ſeem to yield; for their ſelfiſh deſigns, the confidence of the Sovereign would appear betrayed.—Indeed, I had always an high opinion of Mr. Orde's plauſibility. I ſaw he conſtantly affected the language of the gentleman and of the ſcholar; and left baſe calumny and foul invective to be managed by Iriſh organs. I hence concluded, that for the malignant influence of his adminiſtration we ſhould hear a political lullaby; or, in other words, that we were to receive one ſingle benefit for the many evils which we had ſuſtained. I was confirmed in this opinion, by the mighty promiſes held out during two ſucceeding ſeſſions, of a plan of education ſo liberal, and ſo extenſive, that it would carry the light of ſcience into the darkeſt receſſes of our iſland.—Though this plan proceeded on the ridiculous ſuppoſition that complaints and riots were the offſpring of our ignorance, as if no grievances exiſted; yet it was a benefit, and promiſed to efface every veſtige of that moſt tyrannic and gothic policy by which men are debarred from improving their rational faculties.——Public expectation was raiſed very high. Two years were employed in hatching this political embryo, and a third ſeſſion became neceſſary to bring it to maturity. Yet from the outlines of it, with which Mr. Orde has lately favoured us, it appears to be a monſter, and perhaps the greateſt evil of his inauſpicious adminiſtration.

Language is ſo often abuſed in this unhappy country, that we may readily diſtinguiſh between the

the title and nature of a thing; between its apparent and real tendency. Mr. Orde's plan of education has been repeatedly held forth in ſplendid colours; and I am free to acknowledge, that at firſt view it is apt to dazzle; nay, many there are who may conſider its fundamental defects as its greateſt perfections, by which it is calculated to do away bigotry and prejudice of every kind.—The notions which theſe gentlemen have formed to themſelves of bigotry, muſt be very different from the dictates of reaſon. I think that a ſtrict and inviolable attachment to the religion of a man's conſcience, ſo far from meriting the appellation of bigotry, is the fureſt mark of an enlighted mind and an honeſt heart. And ſurely it muſt appear ridiculous in the extreme, to term a baſe indifference to any religion liberality of ſentiment. While the ſincere Chriſtian adheres to the religion of his conſcience, and is therefore entitled to our reſpect, he derives from his paternal authority a right, and is under an obligation of educating his children in his own principles; and this duty of parents muſt appear ſo far ſuperior to all their other duties, as things eternal are to temporal. The religious principles in which children are to be inſtructed, cannot be ſeparated from morality, the inculcating of which is ſo eſſential to the well-being of ſociety; and this great and neceſſary inſtruction muſt, in order to ſucceed, be enlivened with every branch of knowledge which enters the human mind, until it arrives at a ſtate of maturity.—On theſe principles, which I think cannot be controverted with effect, let Mr. Orde's ſyſtem of education be examined, and its real tendency will appear very different from what it promiſes.

I have

I have ſaid, that at firſt view it is apt to dazzle. What can be more extenſive? Pariſh ſchools! Dioceſan ſchools! Provincial ſchools! And a national college! A particular culture, ready prepared for the human mind, at every gradation which it makes towards maturity. It has alſo an appearance of liberality; for Mr. Orde emphatically declares, that theſe fruitful nurſeries are to be open to all denominations of Chriſtians. An *innocent* condition is indeed annexed, requiring the ſuperintendents, profeſſors, and teachers of theſe ſeminaries to be of the eſtabliſhed church; and for this *innocent* condition Mr. Orde aſſigns a very *ſubſtantial* reaſon. He ſays, "that as thoſe em-"ployed in this great buſineſs are to be paid by "the ſtate, it is neceſſary that they ſhould be of "the religion of the ſtate."—This ſubſtantial reaſon leads very far, and cuts off for ever the great body of the people from any chance of emolument, which they might reaſonably expect, in return for the vaſt ſums daily levied on them without their conſent.—The word ſtate with Mr. Orde is a very abſtract term, and the money of the ſtate does not ſeem to be the money of the people.—But the *innocent* condition ſets the whole plan of education, with all its liberality, at variance with the great principles which I have advanced above, and of courſe renders it nugatory: for no Preſbyterians or Catholics can, with conſiſtency of principles, ſend their children to ſuch places of inſtruction.—If Mr. Orde aſſures them, that no mention is to be made of religion, can he anſwer for it? Or can any regulations prevent a zealous teacher from making, *by ſome means or other*, ſuch impreſſions on tender minds as he would wiſh? Or can ſuch general education be carried on without

without any regard to the inculcating of morality? Or can morality be inculcated without a fixed ſyſtem of religious tenets to guide it?—Let Mr. Orde anſwer theſe queſtions before he trifles again with our underſtanding, by calling that liberal which is certainly moſt illiberal. Does he imagine that they can be indifferent about the principles which their children imbibe, who are ready to ſacrifice every temporal conſideration to their own principles?

But this extenſive and liberal plan of education, not only withholds all new advantages, but materially infringes on the few inconſiderable ones already enjoyed by Catholics.—A late act of the legiſlature has, in part, relaxed thoſe barbarous and gothic laws, which forbade intellectual improvement.—This miſerable and partial relaxation, was ſo far from being the effect of enlightened and rational proceedings, that it left groſs inconſiſtencies behind. Catholics were allowed to have ſchools, but no endowments were permitted; by this reſtriction, nothing but a very imperfect claſſical education could be carried on.—The Catholic Clergy were authoriſed by law; foreign education was ſtill forbid; and they were allowed no education at home.—With all theſe inconveniences and inconſiſtencies, ſome advantages accrued which Mr. Orde's plan of education has a manifeſt tendency to ſubvert.—The privilege of educating their youth, ſuch as it was, was not extended to Catholics as an abſolute privilege; it was *wiſely* ſubjected to the good will, pleaſure, or, if you will, whim, of the ordinary of the dioceſe; and we have ſeen this power lately exerciſed in a very arbitrary manner. But however bigotry, or

a tyran-

a tyrannical diſpoſition, might impel an individual to overlook the forms of decorum, it was too odious a precedent to be followed in general.—That a miniſter of religion, and a profeſſor of literature, ſhould openly, without any palliation, check the propagation of knowledge, cannot well bear the face of day! Mr. Orde's plan of education furniſhes every neceſſary palliation. When it has paſſed into a law, not a dioceſan in the kingdom but can with great plauſibility reply to any Catholics who may apply for his certificate, "Good people, for what purpoſe do you demand my certificate? Has not the legiſlature "moſt amply provided for your inſtruction? "Have you not pariſh ſchools? Dioceſan ſchools? "Provincial ſchools? Schools to reſort to? Do "you reject knowledge, becauſe the diſpenſers of "it are Proteſtants? If you do, you betray a "dangerous ſpirit of bigotry, in which you ſhould "not be indulged." And thus are Catholics, who act according to principle, debarred from any education whatſoever!

When we heard education recommended from the throne on a plan the *moſt extenſive and liberal*, either his Majeſty meant theſe words in Mr. Orde's ſenſe, or he did not. The tranſcendent benevolence of our gracious Sovereign cannot ſuffer the ſlighteſt ſuſpicion of the former to reſt on our minds; the latter then comes home to Mr. Orde, and convinces the world, that he has abuſed the confidence of his Sovereign.—That Mr. Orde's plan of education naturally bears my comments, is obvious from his own expreſſions. During the debates, he aſſured gentleman in a very *ſignificant* manner, that nothing could be deviſed ſo favourable to the propagation of the Proteſtant religion.

—He

—He meant that it ſhould have the appearance for the comfort of pious ſouls without producing the effect: for though I believe Mr. Orde to be a very charitable man, yet if the converting of all Iriſhmen to one true religion were to make them one people, perſuaded I am, that in this inſtance Mr. Orde would not wiſh the converſion of ſinners.—Upon the whole, we may pronounce his plan of education a barbarous penal law; ſuch as Europe has not beheld for near a century paſt; the direct aim of which is, to intercept the few vagrant rays of knowledge that enlighten the great body of the people of Ireland; and to extend ſtill further the empire of patronage and of corruption.

It would be too tedious a taſk to enter into a diſcuſſion of the various modes of reſtrictive intolerance practiſed by the preſent miniſtry, until Europe was lately edified by their pious propoſal for proſtrating Catholic chapels, on falſe pretexts and ſlanderous accounts. The general purport of their proceedings ſeems to be, as I have already obſerved, to govern by fear: but how this deſpotic principle will operate under popular forms, it behoves them to conſider. As to their threats and contumelious language, it is truly pitiful to ſee them attempt to manage the great Catholic body, as a pert petulant pedagogue would treat a ſet of naughty boys. The reaſon aſſigned for this their unwarrantable conduct is, becauſe Catholics did not, when their country's grievances were diſcuſſed, and patriotic meaſures purſued, ſtand up, join a Britiſh junto, declare againſt patriotiſm, and betray their country. But the Catholics of Ireland have ever been as remarkable for patriotiſm

tiſm as for loyalty; and I truſt that the neſarious attempts to drive them from both will prove equally unſucceſsful!—Firm in their country's cauſe, and true to a ſovereign to whom they owe gratitude as well as allegiance, they will continue to diſregard the contemptible *petulance* of a boyiſh miniſtry. Or if they ſpeak out, let it be to petition their ſovereign (for the right of petitioning is not yet denied even to *papiſts and beggars*) that he would be graciouſly pleaſed to baniſh ſuch men from his councils for ever.———

If we now take into conſideration the late movements of the eſtabliſhed clergy, we may obſerve a ſtriking relation between their conduct and that of the preſent miniſtry. If miniſtry overleap all bounds of probability, the clergy are not behind hand. Both ſeem to miſtake little cunning for wiſdom, and things incredible and monſtrous are dealt out in order to avert the public view from weak and ſuſpicious quarters.—That the deſcendants of the ancient inhabitants of this iſland, the proprietors of the ſoil, ſhould reaſſume the poſſeſſions of their forefathers involves a phyſical as well as moral impoſſibility, and yet it is bandied about as a probable event whenever Britiſh injuſtice, or Iriſh grievances, are complained of.—With the ſame ſhow of reaſon and the ſame good intention, "conſpiracy, rebellion, pulling down "the church, erecting Popiſh eſtabliſhments, &c. "are painted to our view." Various attempts are made to exaſperate each party, and to alarm all; but leaſt maxims, ſo contrary to the intereſt of Iriſhmen, and to the ſpirit of Chriſtianity, ſhould loſe their intended effect, Iriſh Proteſtants are allured to them by the power of corruption; places,

places, penſions, offices, commiſſions, are daily multiplied; and though it could be eaſily proved, that the hundredth part of the Proteſtants of Ireland can never taſte thoſe promiſed fruits, yet all may ſhare in the hopes of them, and men are often known to feed on, and paſs away their lives in idle hopes.—Something ſimilar may be obſerved of the Proteſtant clergy. The great livings of the church are poſſeſſed by the few, and thoſe generally foreigners: the lower orders of the eſtabliſhed clergy are wretchedly provided for; ſo that a change would infallibly operate in favour of the majority. What then? the pampered dignitaries ſound an alarm, and threaten the whole with deſtruction.—The fears thence enſuing, and the vain hopes on which indigent curates feed, and draw out a wretched exiſtence, make them ſupporters of abuſes by which they ſuffer as well as others.——Upon the whole, the tyrannical maxims propagated by churchmen, as well as ſtateſmen, in this unhappy country, if purſued to the ſame extent in practice, as they are profeſſed in theory, muſt finally bring about what they are intended to avert.

The right Rev. Prelate, who ſo *honourably ſtood forth* of late, might have in view, not only his own intereſt, and the intereſt of his order, but alſo the general devouring intereſt of Britain.—If ſo, what are we to think of his zeal?—If a foreigner be *ſent hither*, not only to enjoy riches and emoluments, but alſo to favour the deſigns of Britain againſt this country: If he flies with extended arms to the ſupport of a church, which ſtandeth in no need of ſupport: If he cries with a loud voice, " to my aſſiſtance fellow Proteſtants, the

" church is in danger," and thus draws their attention from their deareſt rights, and neareſt intereſts: all true Iriſhmen, Proteſtants as well as Catholics, muſt deprecate the interference of ſuch an *agitator!*

Non tali auxilio nec defenſoribus iſtis.

My Lord, in taking leave of your Lordſhip, I have to wiſh, that if we meet again, it may be on better terms. I have alſo to remark, that when a cauſe comes before an impartial and enlightened public; and when ſtubborn facts, and fair and clear concluſions, are produced on one ſide, ſomething more than an affectation of ſilent contempt is required from the other. This hackneyed mode of concealing weakneſs is fallen into diſrepute; and when I ſee Doctor Stock avoid a ſerious diſcuſſion, by expreſſing his contempt of *ferocity*, *petulence*, and *vulgar jocularity*, I cannot but ſuppoſe him deſtitute of argument.

For the inaccuracy of my language, and the incorrectneſs of my ſtyle, I can amply apologize, by ſaying, with Mr. Barber, that I never had acceſs to the *only ſource of whatever learning exiſts amongſt us:* and I can aſſure Mr. Burrowes, who refers Mr. Barber to the ſtreams iſſuing from that *generous* ſource, that I have been *driven* even from the ſtreams. It was thought, I ſuppoſe, as in the fable of old, that my drinking from the ſtream would diſturb the ſource.

The public will decide whether I may, with propriety, ſubſcribe myſelf

AN UNBIASSED IRISHMAN.

P. S. THE Eulogy on the eſtabliſhed Clergy, at the end of Dr. Stock's Pamphlet, muſt be admitted with exceptions. I ſhall mention one, *of which the Doctor is no ſtranger*: " A Clergyman " in the dioceſe of Dublin, in the poſſeſſion of a " rich college living, ſome time ſince ſummoned " the Prieſt of his pariſh before a neighbouring " Juſtice of the Peace, and demanded three half-" crowns, dues for the marriage of one of his Ca-" tholic pariſhioners. When this novel tax was " refuſed, he prevailed on the Juſtice to grant a " warrant, by which the payment was enforced. " The Juſtice ſhortly ſaw the impropriety of his " compliance, and has in many companies ſtated " this fact, with ſentiments of diſtreſs, for having " gratified the avarice of this Clergyman."

FINIS.

BRITISH MUSEUM
30 APR 63